

The Signs of the Times, vol. 12

ESR

Ellet Joseph Waggoner

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
1886	6
January 7, 1886	6
“What the Gospel Teaches” The Signs of the Times, 12, 1.	6
“Encyclical Letter of Pope Leo XIII” The Signs of the Times, 12, 1.	9
January 14, 1886	17
“The Law and the Gospel Co-extensive” The Signs of the Times, 12, 2.	17
“Encyclical Letter of Pope Pius XIII. (Concluded.)” The Signs of the Times, 12, 2.	23
January 21, 1886	28
“Nature of the Law” The Signs of the Times, 12, 3.	28
Nature of the Law	28
January 28, 1886	33
“Nature of the Law (Concluded.)” The Signs of the Times, 12, 4.	33
February 4, 1886	38
“Jurisdiction of the Law” The Signs of the Times, 12, 5.	38
February 11, 1886	44
“Jurisdiction of the Law. (Continued.)” The Signs of the Times, 12, 6.	44
“Faith Healing” The Signs of the Times, 12, 6.	47
February 18, 1886	55
“Jurisdiction of the Law. (Continued.)” The Signs of the Times, 12, 7.	55
“What Is Faith?” The Signs of the Times, 12, 7.	59
February 25, 1886	63
“Jurisdiction of the Law. Why the Law Was Spoken Only to the Jews (Concluded)” The Signs of the Times, 12, 8.	63
“The Chinese Question” The Signs of the Times, 12, 8.	66
March 4, 1886	71
“Throwing the Bible Aside” The Signs of the Times, 12, 9.	71
“Perpetuity of the Law” The Signs of the Times, 12, 9.	72
“Something about Writing” The Signs of the Times, 12, 9.	76
March 11, 1886	81
“A Question Concerning the Sanctuary” The Signs of the Times, 12, 10.	81
“The Foundation of God’s Government” The Signs of the Times, 12, 10.	82
March 18, 1886	88
“Doers of the Law” The Signs of the Times, 12, 11.	88
“Forgiveness; Real, not Figurative” The Signs of the Times, 12, 11.	92
March 25, 1886	95
“Unleavened Bread at Communion” The Signs of the Times, 12, 12.	95
“Justified by Faith” The Signs of the Times, 12, 12.	96
April 1, 1886	103
“Justification and Sanctification” The Signs of the Times, 12, 13.	103
April 8, 1886	109
“Punishment and Torment” The Signs of the Times, 12, 14.	109
“Christ the End of the Law” The Signs of the Times, 12, 14.	111
April 15, 1886	116
“Abolishing the Enmity” The Signs of the Times, 12, 15.	116

"Is It a Whimsey?" The Signs of the Times, 12, 15.	120
April 22, 1886	122
"The Handwriting of Ordinances" The Signs of the Times, 12, 16.	122
May 6, 1886	127
"Under the Law" The Signs of the Times, 12, 17.	127
May 13, 1886	132
"Logical Antinomianism" The Signs of the Times, 12, 18.	132
"Under the Law" The Signs of the Times, 12, 18.	135
"Cleansing of the Sanctuary" The Signs of the Times, 12, 18.	139
May 20, 1886	141
"Dr. Munhall on the Sabbath" The Signs of the Times, 12, 19.	141
"The Bible vs. Mythology" The Signs of the Times, 12, 19.	145
"The Church and Boycotting" The Signs of the Times, 12, 19.	148
May 27, 1886	151
"Under the Law" The Signs of the Times, 12, 20.	151
"Dr. Munhall on the Sabbath" The Signs of the Times, 12, 20.	154
June 3, 1886	159
"Under the Law. (Concluded.)" The Signs of the Times, 12, 21.	159
"A Little Confused" The Signs of the Times, 12, 21.	165
June 10, 1886	166
"The Real Point Involved" The Signs of the Times, 12, 22.	166
"A Feature of Catholicism" The Signs of the Times, 12, 22.	168
June 17, 1886	172
"Religion and Happiness" The Signs of the Times, 12, 23.	172
"Brief Comments on Romans 7" The Signs of the Times, 12, 23.	174
June 24, 1886	180
"Brief Comments on Romans 7. (Concluded.)" The Signs of the Times, 12, 24.	180
"Little Religion" The Signs of the Times, 12, 24.	184
July 1, 1886	186
"When Is It Sunset?" The Signs of the Times, 12, 25.	186
"The Second Commandment" The Signs of the Times, 12, 25.	186
"Practical Thoughts on Psalm 63" The Signs of the Times, 12, 25.	188
July 8, 1886	194
"Comments on Galatians 3. No. 1" The Signs of the Times, 12, 26.	194
"The Doctors Disagree" The Signs of the Times, 12, 26.	196
July 15, 1886	199
"Peter's Vision" The Signs of the Times, 12, 27.	199
"Something To Be Followed" The Signs of the Times, 12, 27.	201
"Comments on Galatians 3. No. 2" The Signs of the Times, 12, 27.	202
Extracts	206
July 22, 1886	208
"Comments on Galatians 3. No. 3" The Signs of the Times, 12, 28.	208
"Rome Never Changes" The Signs of the Times, 12, 28.	210
July 29, 1886	212
"Comments on Galatians 3. No. 4" The Signs of the Times, 12, 29.	212
"Plain Facts on the Sunday Question" The Signs of the Times, 12, 29.	215
August 5, 1886	219
"Comments on Galatians 3. No. 5" The Signs of the Times, 12, 30.	219
"Ex-parte Evidence" The Signs of the Times, 12, 30.	221

“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 12, 30.	224
August 12, 1886	225
“Comments on Galatians 3. No. 6” The Signs of the Times, 12, 31.	225
August 19, 1886	228
“Comments on Galatians 3. No. 7” The Signs of the Times, 12, 32.	228
“Satan as a Deceiver” The Signs of the Times, 12, 32.	231
August 26, 1886	235
“Comments on Galatians 3. No. 8” The Signs of the Times, 12, 33.	235
“Humboldt County Camp-Meeting” The Signs of the Times, 12, 33.	240
September 2, 1886	242
“Comments on Galatians 3. No. 9” The Signs of the Times, 12, 34.	242
“The Only Sure Guide” The Signs of the Times, 12, 34.	248
“Feeding upon Christ” The Signs of the Times, 12, 34.	249
September 9, 1886	251
“Their Wisdom Is Perished” The Signs of the Times, 12, 35.	251
“Who Is Worthy?” The Signs of the Times, 12, 35.	255
“Camp-Meeting in Santa Barbara County” The Signs of the Times, 12, 35.	256
September 16, 1886	259
“In the Law” The Signs of the Times, 12, 36.	259
“The End Near” The Signs of the Times, 12, 36.	263
September 30, 1886	267
“How We May Know” The Signs of the Times, 12, 38.	267
“The Sabbath and Conversion” The Signs of the Times, 12, 38.	267
“The Pork Question Again” The Signs of the Times, 12, 38.	269
October 7, 1886	273
“American Romanism” The Signs of the Times, 12, 39.	273
October 21, 1886	277
“Abominable Prayers” The Signs of the Times, 12, 40.	277
“Real Knowledge” The Signs of the Times, 12, 40.	279
“From the Woodland Camp-Meeting” The Signs of the Times, 12, 40.	284
“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 12, 40.	284
October 28, 1886	289
“California Camp-Meeting” The Signs of the Times, 12, 41.	289
November 4, 1886	294
“What about the Heathen?” The Signs of the Times, 12, 42.	294
November 11, 1886	299
“The Spirit as Guide” The Signs of the Times, 12, 43.	299
November 18, 1886	302
“At the Seat of Mormondom” The Signs of the Times, 12, 44.	302
November 25, 1886	308
“The Origin of Sunday” The Signs of the Times, 12, 45.	308
“Who Is My Neighbor?” The Signs of the Times, 12, 45.	308
December 2, 1886	310
“Items from the General Conference” The Signs of the Times, 12, 46.	310
“Good and Bad Gifts from God” The Signs of the Times, 12, 46.	315
December 9, 1886	321
“Items from the General Conference” The Signs of the Times, 12, 47.	321
December 16, 1886	327

"Items from the General Conference" The Signs of the Times, 12, 48.	327
December 23, 1886	330
"The End Approaching" The Signs of the Times, 12, 49.	330
"Educated Brutality" The Signs of the Times, 12, 49.	335
December 30, 1886	338
"Did the Patriarchs Know Christ?" The Signs of the Times, 12, 50.	338

1886

January 7, 1886

“What the Gospel Teaches” The Signs of the Times, 12, 1.

E. J. Waggoner

“And he said unto him, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned.” *Mark 16:15, 16.* These words were spoken by our Saviour after his resurrection, and shortly before his ascension. They are perfectly in harmony with his words recorded in *Matthew 24:14*, that “this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations.” There is no mistaking the extent of territory in which the gospel must be preached—nothing less than the whole world. And how long must it be preached? Read the whole of *Matthew 24:14*: “And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come.” Then the gospel is to be preached until the end. The end here referred to is the same that is mentioned in *verse 3*, “The end of the world.” That this “end of the world” is in connection with the coming of the Lord, is shown by the words of the disciples in the verse last mentioned, and by the words of Christ in *Matthew 13:40-43; 24:30, 31.* *SITI January 7, 1886, page 82.1*

The fact that by divine command the gospel is to be preached in all the world until the coming of the Lord and the end of the world, proves conclusively that until the Lord comes, a necessity for its being preached will exist in all the world. This needs no further argument, for it is nowhere disputed. We will therefore turn our attention to a consideration of what the gospel is, and what creates the necessity for its being so long and so extensively preached. *SITI January 7, 1886, page 82.2*

The word “gospel” means, literally, “a good message;” Webster’s first definition is “glad tidings.” According to its derivation, it might be applied to any good news; but in the Bible it is used with exclusive

reference to one thing; what that thing is, we may easily learn from the Bible itself. *SITI January 7, 1886, page 82.3*

In *Luke 2:10* we find these words, addressed by the angel of the Lord to the shepherds in the field: "Fear not; for, behold, I bring you good tidings [a gospel] of great joy, which shall be to all people." The next verse tells what this gospel is: "For unto you is born this day in the city of David a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord." Then the gospel which is to be preached to all people is the announcement of a Saviour. It is from this that Webster derives his specific definition of the gospel, as, "especially, the good news concerning Christ and his salvation." *SITI January 7, 1886, page 82.4*

But the simple heralding of Christ, without stating the nature and object of his work, would not be the preaching of the gospel. The "good news" consists in the fact that Christ the Lord is a *Saviour*. That Christ comes as a Saviour, necessarily implies that there are people to be saved, and something from which they must be saved. Turning to *Matthew 1:21*, we read the angel's declaration before the birth of Christ: "And thou shall call his name Jesus; for he shall save his people from their sins." Paul says (*1 Timothy 1:15*): "This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners." So it is manifest that the preaching of the gospel consists in the announcement that Christ will save people from sin. *SITI January 7, 1886, page 82.5*

But while the gospel is the good news that Christ brings salvation from sin, it is evident that that simple announcement would not suffice to produce the desired results, viz., that men should believe and be baptized. For there are millions of people who virtually say that they are "rich and increased with goods, and have need of nothing," not knowing that they are "wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked." No matter how destitute a man may be, it would be of no use to offer him money if he were ignorant of his necessities, and perfectly satisfied with his condition. So no man can feel any interest in the gospel as a means of salvation from sin, unless he (1) knows what sin is, and (2) is convinced that he is a sinner, and (3) understands the nature and results of sin, so as to realize that it is something to be shunned. Therefore the gospel,

with its announcement of salvation from sin, must also make known what sin is. This it does, as we shall see. *SITI January 7, 1886, page 82.6*

John, the evangelist, so called because it is he who more than anyone else dwells on the love of God and Christ in the salvation of man, defines sin. He says: "Whosoever committeth sin transgresseth also the law; for *sin is the transgression of the law.*" *1 John 3:4*. In harmony with this, Paul says that "where no law is, there is no transgression." *Romans 4:15*. And "sin is not imputed when there is no law." *Romans 5:12*. Volumes could not define sin more clearly than do these three texts. We have found out, then, (1) that "gospel" means good news; (2) that the gospel of the Bible is the good news of a Saviour-Christ the Lord (*Luke 2:10, 11*); (3) that Jesus saves from sin (*Matthew 1:21; 1 Timothy 1:15*); and (4) that "sin is the transgression of the law." *1 John 3:4. SITI January 7, 1886, page 82.7*

So that, in short, the gospel announces the way by which man may be saved from the transgression of the law, and from the consequences of such transgression. Sin is the disease; the gospel is the remedy. And since the gospel is to be preached in all the world, until the coming of the Lord, it follows that "all the world," yea, "every creature," has sinned. This we read in *Romans 3:23*: "For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God." *SITI January 7, 1886, page 83.1*

It must also be true that sin will be in the world till the Lord comes. And this we verify by a comparison of *Genesis 6:5* and *13:13* with *Luke 17:26-30*. But since sin is the transgression of the law, it also necessarily follows that "the law" will be in full force in all the world until the coming of the Lord. In other words, sin is the disease, and it cannot exist where there is no law. *Romans 4:15*. The disease, sin, does exist in "every creature" in "all the world;" for the remedy, the gospel, is to be thus extensively made known, and the great Physician would not send the remedy where it is not needed. "They that be whole need not a physician; but they that are sick" (*Matthew 9:12*); and therefore the law, by which alone "is the knowledge of sin"-the disease-is binding upon "every creature" "in all the world." Now since "the wages of sin"-the transgression of the law-"is death"

(*Romans 6:23*), it is important that all men know just what that law is, the transgression of which brings death, and just what its nature and requirements. These points will therefore next claim our attention. E. J. W. *SITI January 7, 1886, page 83.2*

“Encyclical Letter of Pope Leo XIII” The Signs of the Times, 12, 1.

E. J. Waggoner

The letter from Pope Leo XIII., “Concerning the Christian Constitution of States,” addressed “To All the Patriarchs, Primates, Archbishops, and Bishops of the Catholic World,” has spent the subject of considerable comment by both the secular and the religious press. So far as we of seen, it has met with quite a general commendation. The *New York Observer* is an honorable exception to those who, like the *Independent*, think it is “an excellent and sensible pastoral.” We have delayed making any comments upon it until we could read it has published by authority. We now propose to notice a few points in it, simply to show that the Catholic Church is the same in every particular that was four hundred years ago and that people may see with what insidiousness it is making its way in the world. The first thing that attracts the attention is the following statement in the Introduction:-*SITI January 7, 1886, page 6.1*

“The Church looks essentially, and the very nature of her being, to the salvation of souls and the winning for them of happiness in Heaven; nevertheless, she also secures even in this world advantages so many and so great that she could not do more, even if she had been founded primarily and specially to secure prosperity in this life which is worked out upon earth. In truth, wherever the Church has set her foot, she has at once changed the aspect of affairs, colored the manners of the people as with new virtues and a refinement unknown before-as many people as have accepted this have been distinguished for their gentlest, there justice, and the glory of their deeds.”*SITI January 7, 1886, page 6.2*

The above sentences *seem* little involved, but the idea is very clearly expressed, compared with the greater portion of the letter. If we have been correctly informed, Leo XIII. is a close student of the Fathers; and it would seem that he has been an apt student, for his

composition very closely resembles the dry platitudes and the circumlocution which abound in the “Fathers” of the Catholic church. The above paragraph, however, is clear enough to convince any who will think, that it is groundless assumption. In proof of its falsity, one has only to think of the natives of Mexico, Central America, Spain, and Italy. These countries have been under Catholic rule for centuries, and may be taken as representative instances of the refining and civilizing influence of the Roman Catholic Church. If the statement of the pope be true, those countries ought to lead the world and everything. On the contrary, however, they are at the bottom of the list. Of some of them it may be said that they have even deteriorated under the papal influence. The Italian Government, since Victor Emmanuel rescued it from papal oppression, has taken a leading position, although not much can yet be said for the great mass of poor, deluded Italians themselves. But this only makes more prominent the evils of Catholic rule. It is true that many Catholics have been distinguished, but not as a consequence of their Catholicism. The truth is, as appears further on in the letter, the Catholic Church adapts itself to the people. Among civilized people it has all the learning known to the school; but it is content to leave savage races where it finds them. Provided they will acknowledge its power. *SITI January 7, 1886, page 6.3*

The following paragraph sounds very well, and, taken by itself, would not be very objectionable:- *SITI January 7, 1886, page 6.4*

“As it is not lawful for anybody to neglect his duties towards God, and as it is the first duty to embrace, in mind and then conduct, religion-not such as each may choose, but such as God commands-in the same manner States cannot, without a crime, act as though God did not exist, or cast off the care of religion as alien to them or useless, or out of several kinds of religion adopt indifferently which they please; but they are absolutely bound to, in the worship of the Deity, to adopt that use and manner in which God himself shows that he wills to be adored. Therefore among the rulers the name of God must be holy; but it must be reckoned among the first of their duties to favor religion, protect it, and cover it with the authority of the laws, and act to institute or decree anything which is incompatible with its security.” *SITI January 7,*

Whether there is anything wrong in this statement or not depends upon the source from whence it proceeds, as will hereafter be seen. When the pope speaks of religion, he means the Catholic Church alone. The following paragraph explains the above, and shows what he desires when he says that rulers must cover religion with the authority of the laws. It is entitled, "What the Church has Done for Civilization":-*SITI January 7, 1886, page 7.1*

"There was once a time when the philosophy of the gospel governed states; then it was that the power and divine virtue of Christian wisdom had penetrated into the laws, institutions, and manners of the people-indeed, into all the ranks and relations of the State; when the religion instituted by Jesus Christ, firmly established in that degree of dignity which was befitting, flourished everywhere, in the favor of rulers and under the due protection of magistrates; when the priesthood and the government were united by concord and a friendly interchange of offices. And the State composed in that fashion produced, in the opinion of all, more excellent fruits, the memory of which still flourishes, and will flourish, attested by innumerable monuments which can neither be destroyed nor obscured by any art of the adversary. If Christian Europe subdued barbarous peoples, and transferred them from a savage to a civilized state, from superstition to the truth; if she victoriously repelled the invasions of the Muhammedans; if civilization retained the chief power, and accustomed herself to afford others a leader and mistress in everything that adorns humanity; if she has granted to the peoples true and manifold liberty; if she has most established many institutions for the solace of wretchedness, beyond controversy is greatly due to religion, under whose auspices great undertakings were commenced and with whose aid they were perfected. Truly the same excellent state of things would have continued if the agreement of the two powers had continued if greater things might rightfully have been expected if there had been obedience to the authority, the sway, the counsels of the church, characterized by greater faithfulness and perseverance," etc.*SITI January 7, 1886, page 7.2*

Who cannot see that this is a long look backward to the time when

the pope ruled kings, and when with a word he released subjects from their allegiance to their rightful rulers? The time when the pope forced an emperor in Germany to stand for three days in the snow, awaiting the papal pleasure: when a legate of the pope used as a foot-ball the crown of a king of England; when designing men waxed rich off from the superstitions and vices of the ignorant, by selling them pretended indulgences; when the pope had such control of the people's consciences that he could keep them in so great a state of degradation that even the ignorant rabble whom he made to be priests, were far above them; the time when thousands of priests had never seen a copy of the Bible, and when, as a consequence, the pure principles of the gospel had almost ceased to be recognized in the world, so that the very name of priest was almost a synonym for libertine; when the few who dared refuse obedience to the vile men who presumed to stand in the place of Christ, were proscribed and hunted from the earth with the most diabolical tortures which demons in human shape could invent; and when the pope publicly gave thanks to God for the massacre of sixty thousand Huguenots, whose only offense was that they believed the Bible;-these are the times for which Leo XIII. longs. These are some of the "excellent fruits" of the union of the Church and the State. And the pope truly says that "greater things might rightfully have been expected," "if the agreement of the two powers had continued." Let the so-called "National Reform Party" make a note of this.*SITI January 7, 1886, page 7.3*

That the above state of things is what the pope desires, is shown by his reference to the Reformation as "that dreadful and deplorable zeal for revolution which was aroused in the sixteenth century, after the Christian religion had been thrown into confusion." And in spite of all this, there are professed Protestants who think that the letter is "an excellent and sensible pastoral." Sensible it may be, from the Catholic standpoint, but we deny its excellence from any standpoint whatever.*SITI January 7, 1886, page 7.4*

Following up the above statements, the pope says of the Reformation and its results:-*SITI January 7, 1886, page 7.5*

"And since the people is said to contain in itself the fountain of all right and of all power, it will follow that the State deems itself bound

by no kind of duty towards God; that no religion should be publicly professed; nor ought there to be any inquiry [by the State], but to each equal rights ought to be assigned with the sole end that the social order incurs no injury from them.”*SITI January 7, 1886, page 7.6*

The above needs no special comment here. We merely ask the reader to compare it with some of the extracts which follow, and which shows that the Roman Catholic Church holds that no other form of religion ought to be tolerated in the State.*SITI January 7, 1886, page 7.7*

In the following, the Pope shows still more plainly, the design of the Roman Church:-*SITI January 7, 1886, page 7.8*

“Those foundations of the State being admitted, which at this time are in such general favor, it easily appears into how unfavorably a position the church is driven. For when the conduct of affairs is in accordance with the doctrines of this kind, to the Catholic name is assigned an equal position with, or even an inferior position to, that of alien societies in the State; no regard is paid to each ecclesiastical laws; and the church, which, by the command and mandate of Jesus Christ, ought to teach all nations, finds itself forbidden in any way to interfere in the instructions of the people.”*SITI January 7, 1886, page 7.9*

The “Church” finds itself forbidden “to interfere” in the instructions of the people. That is, the Catholic Church has to be content with the same privileges that are granted to other religious bodies. This is truly an “unfavorable position” for a church that has been accustomed to enforce its dogmas by the sword, the rack, and the stake.*SITI January 7, 1886, page 7.10*

Again we quote:-*SITI January 7, 1886, page 7.11*

“Concerning the reasons for the separation of Church and State, the same pontiff [Gregory XVI.] speaks thus: and ‘Nor can we hope happier results either for religion or the Government, from the wishes of those who are eagerly desirous that the Church should be separated from a State, and the mutual good understanding of the sovereign secular power and the sacerdotal authority be broken up.

It is evident that those lovers of the most shameless liberty dread that concord which has always been fortunate and wholesome, both for sacred and civil interests.' To like the effect Pius IX., as opportunity offered, noted many false opinions, which had begun to be of great strength, and afterwards ordered them to be collected together, in order that in so great a conflux of errors, Catholics might have something which, without stumbling, they might follow." *SITI January 7, 1886, page 7.12*

To a careless reader the above statement might seem to be very innocent; but it can easily be shown that it endorses all of the intolerance which ever disgraced the papacy in the Dark Ages. Read again the reference to Pius IX., and the "false opinions" which he noted and caused to be collected. This refers to the "Syllabus of Errors" which was put forth by Pious IX. This "Syllabus" is a collection of about eighty statements, all of which are declared to be grievous errors. We have space for only a few of these "errors." Number 21 is as follows:-*SITI January 7, 1886, page 7.13*

"The Church has not the power of defining dogmatically that the religion of the Catholic Church is the only true religion." *SITI January 7, 1886, page 7.14*

Remember that the Catholic Church holds just the opposite of this "error." According to this, none of the Roman Catholics have any religion at all. The 23rd "error" which the pope unqualifiedly condemns, is that:-*SITI January 7, 1886, page 7.15*

"The Roman pontiffs and ecumenical councils have exceeded the limits of their power, have usurped the rights of princes, and have even committed errors in defining matters of faith and morals." *SITI January 7, 1886, page 7.16*

On no ground can it be held that Roman pontiffs have *not* usurped the rights of princes, except on the ground that princes have no right which popes are bound to recognize; and this is just what the Roman Church holds. And right here we might note that the papacy finds a parallel in the self-styled "National Reform Association," which, according to its organ, the *Christian Statesman*, holds that "the State and its sphere exists for the sake of, and to serve the interests of the Church." Human meant nature has not changed a

particle in the last three or four hundred years, and every principle of reasoning justifies the statement that such sentiments as the above, whether held by popes or by professed Protestants, will work out the same results in the nineteenth century that they did in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries.*SITI January 7, 1886, page 7.17*

“Errors” number 24 and 27 are as follows:-*SITI January 7, 1886, page 7.18*

“The Church has not the power of availing herself of force, or any direct or indirect temporal power.”*SITI January 7, 1886, page 7.19*

“The ministers of the Church and the Roman pontiff, ought to be absolutely excluded from all charge and dominion over temporal affairs.”*SITI January 7, 1886, page 7.20*

Of course these are errors, if this is true that Roman pontiffs have never exceeded their jurisdiction, nor usurped the rights of princes; and this is what Leo XIII. reiterates in his “excellent and sensible pastoral.” And the “National Reform Association,” and all who favor it, cannot consistently deny the pope’s claim.*SITI January 7, 1886, page 7.21*

One more quotation from the “Syllabus of Errors” must suffice to show that Leo XIII. holds exactly the same views that were held by his predecessor, Pius IX. and, by the amiable Leo X., who placed Luther under ban, and caused the Christians of his time to be slaughtered. Numbers 77 and 78 of the “errors” noted by Pious IX are the following:-*SITI January 7, 1886, page 7.22*

“In the present day it is no longer expedient that the Catholic religion shall be held as the only religion of the State, to the exclusion of all other modes of worship.”*SITI January 7, 1886, page 7.23*

“Whence it has been widely provided by law, in some countries called Catholic, that persons coming to reside therein shall enjoy the public exercise of their own worship.”*SITI January 7, 1886, page 7.24*

Which means that Leo XIII., in common with Pius IX. and all the popes who ever reigned, holds that the Roman Catholic religion ought to be held as the only religion of the State, "to the exclusion of all other modes of worship," and that persons coming to reside in countries called Catholic, ought not to be allowed to enjoy the public exercise of their own worship. Let those who will, applaud such sentiments; we will not. E. J. W. *SITI January 7, 1886, page 7.25*

(Concluded next week.)

January 14, 1886

“The Law and the Gospel Co-extensive” The Signs of the Times, 12, 2.

E. J. Waggoner

In *Nehemiah 9:13* we find the following words in the Levites' confession to God: “Thou camest down also upon Mount Sinai; and spakest with them from heaven, and gavest them right judgments and true laws, good statutes and commandments.” Here we have reference made to true laws and good statutes. A good and true law would in every case condemn sin; therefore the law here referred to is of the same character as that which, being transgressed, makes it necessary for the gospel to be preached. This law was given upon Mount Sinai; so we examine the law there given to see if it meets the requirements. *SITI January 14, 1886, page 22.1*

In the 19th of Exodus we have a description of the preparation of the people to hear the law from Sinai. We read:-*SITI January 14, 1886, page 22.2*

“And the Lord said unto Moses, Go unto the people, and sanctify them to-day and to-morrow, and let them wash their clothes, and be ready against the third day: for the third day the Lord will come down in the sight of all the people upon mount Sinai.” *Exodus 19:10, 11. SITI January 14, 1886, page 22.3*

“And it came to pass on the third day in the morning, that there were thunders and lightnings, and a thick cloud upon the mount, and the voice of the trumpet exceeding loud; so that all the people that was in the camp trembled. And Moses brought forth the people out of the camp to meet with God; and they stood at the nether part of the mount. And mount Sinai was altogether on a smoke, because the Lord descended upon it in fire: and the smoke thereof ascended as the smoke of a furnace, and the whole mount quaked greatly.” *Exodus 19:16-18. SITI January 14, 1886, page 22.4*

This was the condition of Mount Sinai when from it God spoke “true laws, good statutes and commandments.” *Chapter 20, verses 3-17*, contains the words which God spoke at that time. We quote them in

full:-*SITI January 14, 1886, page 22.5*

1. "Thou shalt have no other gods before me.*SITI January 14, 1886, page 22.6*

2. "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth. Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them, nor serve them: for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me; and shewing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments.*SITI January 14, 1886, page 22.7*

3. "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain: for the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh his name in vain.*SITI January 14, 1886, page 22.8*

4. "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work: But the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it.*SITI January 14, 1886, page 22.9*

5. "Honor thy father and thy mother: that thy days may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee.*SITI January 14, 1886, page 22.10*

6. "Thou shalt not kill.*SITI January 14, 1886, page 22.11*

7. "Thou shalt not commit adultery.*SITI January 14, 1886, page 22.12*

8. "Thou shalt not steal.*SITI January 14, 1886, page 22.13*

9. "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour.*SITI January 14, 1886, page 22.14*

10. "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbours house, thou shalt not covet thy neighbours wife, nor his manservant, nor his maidservant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor any thing that is thy neighbours." *SITI January 14, 1886, page 22.15*

These are the words which the Lord spoke in the hearing of all the people, from the midst of the fire and smoke upon Mount Sinai. Soon afterward he spoke to Moses, as follows:-*SITI January 14, 1886, page 22.16*

"Come up to me into the mount, and be there: and I will give thee tables of stone, and a law, and commandments which I have written; that thou mayest teach them." *Exodus 24:12.SITI January 14, 1886, page 22.17*

Accordingly, we find by reading the remaining verses of the chapter, that Moses went up into the mount, and remained there with God forty days and forty nights. While he was there, the Lord gave him minute directions concerning the building of the sanctuary. Then we read:-*SITI January 14, 1886, page 22.18*

"And he gave unto Moses, when he had made an end of communing with him upon Mount Sinai, two tables of testimony, tables of stone, written with the finger of God." *Exodus 31:18.SITI January 14, 1886, page 22.19*

"And Moses turned, and went down from the mount, and the two tables of the testimony were in his hand; the tables were written on both their sides; on the one side and on the other were they written. And the tables were the work of God, and the writing was the writing of God, graven upon the tables." *Exodus 32:15, 16.SITI January 14, 1886, page 22.20*

Then we are told how Moses, as he drew near the camp, saw the golden calf, and the people dancing around it, "and he cast the tables out of his hands, and brake them beneath [at the foot of] the mount." But this was not the end of the matter; for very soon we read thus:-*SITI January 14, 1886, page 22.21*

"And the Lord said unto Moses, Hew thee two tables of stone like unto the first: and I will write upon these tables the words that were

in the first tables, which thou brakest.” *Exodus 34:1.SITI January 14, 1886, page 22.22*

We will now read the words of Moses, as he rehearses the whole matter to the Israelites, just before his death. We begin with the point last quoted:-*SITI January 14, 1886, page 23.1*

“At that time the Lord said unto me, Hew thee two tables of stone like unto the first, and come up unto me into the mount, and make thee an ark of wood. And I will write on the tables the words that were in the first tables which thou brakest, and thou shalt put them in the ark. And I made an ark of shittim wood, and hewed two tables of stone like unto the first, and went up into the mount, having the two tables in mine hand. And he wrote on the tables, according to the first writing, the ten commandments, which the Lord spake unto you in the mount, out of the midst of the fire, in the day of the assembly; and the Lord gave them unto me. And I turned myself and came down from the mount, and put the tables in the ark which I had made; and there they be, as the Lord commanded me.” *Deuteronomy 10:1-5.SITI January 14, 1886, page 23.2*

One more quotation on this point. In the course of Moses’ final address to the people, in which he rehearsed all their history in the wilderness, he repeated the substance of the ten commandments, and at the close he said:-*SITI January 14, 1886, page 23.3*

“These words the Lord spake unto all your assembly in the mount out of the midst of the fire, of the cloud, and of the thick darkness, with a great voice: and he added no more. And he wrote them in two tables of stone, and delivered them unto me.” *Deuteronomy 5:22.SITI January 14, 1886, page 23.4*

The gist of these texts of Scripture may be expressed as follows: The good and true laws which were spoken upon Sinai (*Nehemiah 9:13*) were the ten commandments, found in *Exodus 20:3-17*; these ten commandments were written by God himself on two tables of stone; and there was nothing spoken to the people by the Lord, except that which was placed upon the tables of stone (*Deuteronomy 5:22*). Therefore the words found in *Exodus 20:3-17*, and no others, form the ten commandments, the perfect law of God.*SITI January 14, 1886, page 23.5*

But what has this to do with the gospel? Just this: We found that the gospel is the remedy for sin, which is the transgression of the law; and that the law must be in force as long and as extensively as the gospel is preached. We were concerned to know what law it is the transgression of which makes it necessary for the gospel to be preached, and we have now found it. One more step completes the identification. It is this:-*SITI January 14, 1886, page 23.6*

Paul says (*Romans 7:7*): "What shall we say then? Is the law sin? God forbid. Nay, I had not know sin, but by the law; for I had not know lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet." The law here referred to must be the same law that is referred to in *John 3:4*, because it is one that points out sin; it does this because it is "holy, and just, and good." Therefore it is the law to which the gospel relates. And what law is it?-It is the law which condemns unlawful desire by saying, "Thou shalt not covet." But this is the last one of the ten commandments. Therefore we have proved to a demonstration that the ten commandments of *Exodus 20:3-17*, -those commandments which were spoken by Jehovah, in the mount, out of the midst of the fire, of the smoke, and of the thick darkness, and which were written on two tables of stone and deposited in the ark,-form the law which points out sin. They are the law which has been universally trodden underfoot, making it necessary that the gospel should be preached in all the world, to every creature; and, therefore, it is as plain as the Scripture can make it, that they are still binding upon every creature in every part of the world. If it were otherwise, there would be no sin, and, consequently, no need of the gospel. Whoever, therefore, says that he is not under the jurisdiction of those ten commandments, virtually says that he has no sin; and whoever says that he has no sin, places himself outside of the gospel plan; for "Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners," and no others. His salvation has reference only to those who have transgressed the law of God, the ten commandments.*SITI January 14, 1886, page 23.7*

The above argument is, we think, so conclusive as to make it almost unnecessary to notice the assumption that the gospel of Christ is that which points out sin. If this were true, we should have Christ introducing the gospel into the world in order to save men from the rejection of it! That is, the remedy for the disease creates

the disease, the remedy being introduced to cure that which without it would never have existed! Such an absurdity is too puerile to be entertained for a moment. The gospel must relate to something outside of and prior to itself. Since the gospel saves from sin, it is evident that sin existed before the gospel, and that it continues to exist so long as the gospel exists; and since sin is the transgression of the law, it is just as evident that the law existed before there was sin, and, consequently, before there was any gospel, or any need of it, and that it exists as long, at least, as the gospel exists.*SITI January 14, 1886, page 23.8*

The testimony of men can never add to the force of the Bible; but to show that the view taken here is not a peculiar one among Christians, we quote from the two men, both imminent for scholarship and piety:-*SITI January 14, 1886, page 23.9*

“The ordinary method of God is to convict sinners by the law, and that only. The gospel is not the means by which God hath ordained, or which our Lord himself used, for this end. We have no authority in Scripture for applying it thus, nor any ground to think it will prove effectual. Nor have we any more ground to expect this from the nature of the thing. ‘They that are whole,’ as our Lord himself observed, ‘need not a physician, but they that are sick.’ It is absurd, therefore, to offer a physician to them that are whole, or that at least imagine themselves so to be. You are first to convince them that they are sick; otherwise they will not thank you for your labor. It is equally absurd to offer Christ to those whose heart is whole, having never yet been broken. It is, in the proper sense, casting pearls before swine. Doubtless they will trample them underfoot; and it is no more than you have reason to expect, if they also turn again and rend you.”- *Wesley’s Works, Vol. 1, Sermon 85.SITI January 14, 1886, page 23.10*

“The law of God, and its great and solemn injunctions, should be distinctly set forth. Our congregations should be gathered as a round the base of Mount Sinai, while from its summit is heard the voice of God in those commandments which from its summit are heard the voice of God in those commandments which are unalterable and the eternal in their character. The effect of these utterances will be, that conscience will be awakened, and hearts will

tremble. Some will say, with Moses, 'I do exceedingly fear and quake,' when they behold the majesty of law, the purity of God, and their own impurity. Others may be repelled, and will say, 'Let not God speak to us anymore.' Some will object to the sternness of the law, and will say, 'Prophecy smooth things;' but still that law must be preached. It brings the sinner to recognition of his sins in having transgressed God's holy law, and shows him the fearfulness of the doom which is impending over him.*SITI January 14, 1886, page 23.11*

"The law must be followed by the gospel; the awakened sinner must be pointed to the Saviour, that he may feel that, deep as are the stains of his transgressions, the blood of Christ can wash them all away. There are many preachers who love to dwell on the gospel alone. They talk sweetly and beautifully of the fatherhood of God. This is well. It is more than well. It is essential. But sometimes they go beyond this, and declaim against the preaching of the law-intimate that it belongs to a past age, a less civilized society; that men can best be moved by love alone, and they rely wholly on its attractive power. Such a gospel may rear a beautiful structure, but its foundation is in the sand. No true edifice can be raised without its foundations of being dug deep by repentance toward God, and then shall the rock be reached, and the building shall be strong enough through faith in Jesus Christ. The law without gospel is dark and hopeless; the gospel without law is inefficient and powerless. The one leads to servitude, the other to antinomianism. The two combined to produce 'charity out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned.'" -*Bishop Simpson in "Lectures on Preaching," pp. 188, 189. SITI January 14, 1886, page 23.12*

The obligations which rests upon all mankind to keep the law of God, will be considered more at length in future articles. E. J. W.*SITI January 14, 1886, page 23.13*

"Encyclical Letter of Pope Pius XIII. (Concluded.)" The Signs of the Times, 12, 2.

E. J. Waggoner

(Concluded.)

But as the pope proceeds, he grows more bold, and speaks out the popish views so plainly that it would seem that even the most blind Protestant might take the alarm. He says:-*SITI January 14, 1886, page 24.1*

"These, then, are the things taught by the Catholic Church concerning the constitution and government of the State. Concerning these sayings and decrees, if a men will only judge dispassionately, no form of government is, *per se*, condemned if so long as it has nothing repugnant to Catholic doctrine, and is able, if wisely and justly managed, to preserve the State in the best condition. Nor is it, *per se*, to be condemned whether the people have a greater or less share in the government; for at certain times, and with the guarantee of certain laws, such participation may appertain, not only to the usefulness, but even to the duty of the citizens. Moreover, there is no just cause that anyone should condemn the Church as being too restrictive in gentleness, or inimical to that liberty which is natural and legitimate. In truth, the Church judges it not lawful that the various kinds of divine worship should have the same right as the true religion; still it does not condemn those governors of States, who, for the sake of acquiring some great good, or to prevent great ill, patiently bear with manners and customs, so that each kind of religion has its place in the State."*SITI January 14, 1886, page 24.2*

Let no one think that "the Church" would lay out a cast-iron rule for the government of States. Let not patriotic Americans be alarmed. The pope does not condemn a Republican form of government, nor indeed any form of government, *per se*, if it will only work for the interests of the papacy. The Catholic Church is just as well satisfied to control a senate or a legislature as it is to control a king. And let no one, says the crafty Leo, condemn the Church for its leniency in tolerating the other forms of worship than the Catholic, because it does not now, any more than it ever did, judge it lawful that the various kinds of divine worship should have the same right as the Catholic religion; but, owing to its present "unfavorable position," it is not able to "interfere" as much as it would like to. And, moreover, the Roman Church, so great is its kindness, does not condemn those rulers to allow "each kind of religion" to have "its place in the State," since, on account of the existing circumstances, they cannot

help themselves. That is, the pope does not condemn rulers for not persecuting Protestants, when they have not the power to do so! what marvelous gentleness!*SITI January 14, 1886, page 24.3*

And then, as if to emphasize the fact that the Catholic Church still cherishes, as a precious legacy, the principles (or, rather, the lack of principles), which caused Huss and Jerome and thousands of others to be burned at the stake, the pope says:-*SITI January 14, 1886, page 24.4*

“Therefore at so critical a juncture of events, Catholic men, if, as it behooves them, they will listen to us, will easily see what are their own and each other’s duties in matters of *opinion* as well as of *action*. And the formation of opinion, whatsoever things the Roman pontiffs have handed down, each and every one is it necessary to hold in firm judgment, well understood, and as often as occasion demands, openly to declare.”*SITI January 14, 1886, page 24.5*

But how shall these wise and humane recommendations be carried into effect? The pope provides for this as follows:-*SITI January 14, 1886, page 24.6*

“But generally, as we have said, to wish to take no part in public affairs would be in that degree vicious, in which it brought to the common weal neither care nor work; and on this account the more so, because Catholic men are bound by the admonition of the doctrine which they profess, to do what has to be done with integrity and with faith. If, on the contrary, they are idle, those whose opinions do not in truth give any great hope of safety, would easily get possession of the reins of government. This also would be attended with danger to the Christian name, because they would become most powerful who are badly disposed to the Church, and those least powerful who are well disposed. Wherefore it is evident that there is just cause for Catholics to undertake the conduct of public affairs; for they do not assume those responsibilities to approve of what is not lawful and the methods of government at this time; but in order that they may turn these very methods, as far as may be, to the unmixed and true public good, holding this purpose in their minds, to infuse into all the veins of the commonwealth the wisdom and virtue of the Catholic religion.”*SITI January 14, 1886,*

Is there any one who cannot see the meaning of this? Is it an innocent and harmless recommendation? Read it again carefully. Catholic men ought to take active part in public affairs. Well, is there any reason why they should not? No; a Catholic has as good a right to vote as anybody else has; but we would have professed Protestants alive to the object for which they vote, so that it may be defeated. Why should Catholic men not be idle in public affairs? Because if they are, those were not favorable to popish assumptions will get the reins of government. This must not be allowed. No one need think that a Catholic, but becoming active in the politics of a Government that is non-Catholic, does so because he approves of that form of Government, but because the design is to turn “these very methods” to the support of the “public good.” In other words, the pope is anxious to use even this Republican Government for the support of papal pretensions.*SITI January 14, 1886, page 24.8*

In connection with the last quotation, read the following:-*SITI January 14, 1886, page 24.9*

“The means to seek these ends can scarcely be laid down upon one uniformed plan, since they must suit places and times different from each other. Nevertheless, in the first place, let concord of wills be preserved, and a likeness of things to be done be sought for. And each will be attained to the best, if all shall consider the admonitions of the apostolic see a law of conduct, and shall obey the bishops.”*SITI January 14, 1886, page 24.10*

What does this mean? It means that whatever methods varying circumstances demand should be employed. Only one object is in view, and that is to secure the advancement of the Roman Catholic religion, to the exclusion of all other forms of worship. It means that whether in Europe or in the United States, the Roman Catholic who engages in politics is to “consider the admonitions of the apostolic see a law of conduct,” and to “obey the bishops.” It means that a steady and untiring effort is being made to bring the United States, as well as all other Governments, under the dictation of a foreign, ecclesiastical ruler, the representative of that “man of sin,” “who

oppose and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped.” We claim that these conclusions are legitimately drawn from the letter of Pope Leo XIII., and not only so, but these things are plainly stated in that letter. Every candid person must testify that we have not wrested the pope’s meaning in the slightest degree. His words speak for themselves.*SITI January 14, 1886, page 24.11*

And now someone will ask: Do you really imagine that the pope will ever gain such control as he desires? Not in this country; but the danger is none the less, notwithstanding. When Protestants can see nothing but what is perfectly allowable in such a letter as that of the pope’s, and can even commend it, it shows that the principles of what is nowadays termed Protestantism are not very different from those of Catholicism. The angel of Revelation, who announced the judgment of the great harlot, Babylon, declared that “all nations have drunk of the wine of the wrath of her fornication.” *Revelation 18:3*. Fornication, when applied to the church, means connection with the world, which, on the part of the church, is always unlawful; and the position which the majority of professed Protestants take concerning the pope’s views on “the Christian Constitution of States,” shows that people are fast becoming intoxicated with the pleasing idea that the church, instead of depending alone on the pure words of the gospel, ought to unite with the world, that it may secure support from it. So intoxicated are they that their vision is affected, so that they cannot see anything wrong in the demands of the papacy. Surely it cannot be long before the likeness to the beast will be complete. And when this unholy union has been consummated, then we may be sure that all the wrath of offend supreme power will be visited upon those who will maintain their allegiance to God alone.*SITI January 14, 1886, page 25.1*

We are willing to be called alarmists, for we are commanded to “sound an alarm.” *Joel 2:1*. God grant that many may heed the alarm, and in keeping “the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus,” may find a safe refuge from the unmingled wrath of God, infinitely greater and more terrible than that of all the nations of earth, which is sure to be visited upon all who worship either the beast or his image. E. J. W.*SITI January 14, 1886, page 25.2*

January 21, 1886

“Nature of the Law” *The Signs of the Times*, 12, 3.

E. J. Waggoner

Nature of the Law

Having found that the law must be in force wherever the gospel is preached, it is very proper that we learn something in regard to its nature. What we have already learned would teach us that it is just the opposite of sin, for “sin is the transgression of the law.” But we will see what the Bible has to say further on this subject.*SITI January 21, 1886, page 39.1*

We first quote the words of the psalmist, in *Psalms* 19:7, 8, 10, 11:-*SITI January 21, 1886, page 39.2*

“The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul; the testimony of the Lord is sure, making wise the simple. The statutes of the Lord are right, rejoicing the heart; the commandment of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes.” “More to be desired are they than gold, yea, than much fine gold; sweeter also than honey and the honeycomb. Moreover by them is thy servant warned; and in keeping of them there is great reward.”*SITI January 21, 1886, page 39.3*

This comprises all that may be said of the law; for nothing can be more than perfect. Nothing can be added to that which is perfect, neither can anything be taken away, without leaving it imperfect. Therefore the testimony of David teaches us that when God spoke his law it was in just the form that he wanted it, and that he never designed that any change should be made in it.*SITI January 21, 1886, page 39.4*

In perfect accord with the above testimony, the apostle Paul says: “Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment is holy, and just, and good.” *Romans* 7:12. This being so, we would naturally expect that the keeping of the commandments would make the keeper thereof perfect and holy. This we find is the case. Moses said to the Israelites:-*SITI January 21, 1886, page 39.5*

“And it shall be our righteousness, if we observe to do all these commandments before the Lord our God, as he hath commanded us.” *Deuteronomy 6:25.SITI January 21, 1886, page 39.6*

Observe how perfectly this agrees with what we find in the New Testament: Moses said that to keep the law is righteousness. Of course the opposite of righteousness is unrighteousness, and John tells us that “all unrighteousness is sin.” *1 John 5:17*. Then we must conclude that sin is just the opposite of obedience to the law; and that brings us to the original definition: “Sin is the transgression of the law.” *1 John 3:4*. Unrighteousness means any deviation from that which is right; and since all unrighteousness is sin, we know that the slightest deviation from right is a transgression of the law. To show that this reasoning has solid scriptural foundation, we quote *Psalms 119:96:-SITI January 21, 1886, page 39.7*

“I have seen an end of all perfection; but thy commandment is exceeding broad.” And to show how broad and far-reaching it is, we have only to read *Hebrews 4:12:-SITI January 21, 1886, page 40.1*

“For the word of God is quick, and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart.” *SITI January 21, 1886, page 40.2*

Thus we learn that the law is so broad that it takes cognizance of the very thoughts of the heart, and not alone the outward acts. As illustrating this, we have our Saviour’s words in the sermon on the mount: *-SITI January 21, 1886, page 40.3*

“Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not kill; and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment; but I say unto you, That whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment; and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council; but whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire.” *Matthew 5:21, 22.SITI January 21, 1886, page 40.4*

Again we quote *verses 27 and 28* of the same chapter: *-SITI January 21, 1886, page 40.5*

“Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not commit adultery; but I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart.” *SITI January 21, 1886, page 40.6*

Other instances might be given; but these are sufficient to show the breadth of the commandments of God. The sixth commandment may be broken by a single angry thought that may never be expressed; and the seventh may be as effectually broken by a single wrong desire as by the overt act. Surely the law of God is broad; and since in all its prohibitions and requirements it is perfect, we can readily and naturally accept the words of the wise man, in *Ecclesiastes 12:13:-SITI January 21, 1886, page 40.7*

“Let us hear the conclusion of the whole matter: Fear God, and keep his commandments; for this is the whole duty of man.” *SITI January 21, 1886, page 40.8*

This statement, we repeat, is a natural consequence of what has preceded; for the keeping of a perfect law will make a man perfect, and nothing more than perfection can be required. There is no sin conceivable that is not forbidden by the ten commandments, and no righteous act or thought that is not commended and enjoined by them. Of course it would be impossible to go through the whole list of possible thoughts and deeds, in order to demonstrate this; but it will be found true in every case. Things may be mentioned which at first sight may seem to many persons to be outside of the ten commandments; but a little careful thought will show that nothing can be done that is beyond or outside of the perfect law of God. We have not the slightest fear of being brought to confusion because of this statement. We repeat, Nothing more than the duties enjoined in the ten commandments can be required of any man. *SITI January 21, 1886, page 40.9*

In this connection it will be well to notice *Matthew 5:20*, which some may think opposed to the statement last made, but which strongly supports it. We quote: “For I say unto you, That except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of Heaven.” This text would be opposed to the statement made in the preceding

paragraph if it could be shown that the scribes and Pharisees kept the law perfectly, but not otherwise. Indeed, this verse could not teach that it is a man's duty to do more than the ten commandments, without contradicting the *19th verse*, which says that "whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of Heaven." It must be, then, that the scribes and Pharisees, while professing to keep the commandments, did not do all that the law requires. This we shall find was the case, if we read *Matthew 23:25-28:-SITI January 21, 1886, page 40.10*

"Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye make clean the outside of the cup and of the platter, but within they are full of extortion and excess. Thou blind Pharisee, cleanse first that which is within the cup and platter, that the outside of them may be clean also. Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees hypocrites! for ye are like unto whited sepulchres, which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within full of dead men's bones, and of all uncleanness. Even so ye also outwardly appear righteous unto men, but within ye are full of hypocrisy and iniquity." *SITI January 21, 1886, page 40.11*

The scribes and Pharisees pretended to keep the law, and so far as their outward acts were concerned, they did keep it; but Christ, who "knew what was in man," saw that in their hearts they despised the law, and that they grievously transgressed it, but yet in such a way that men could not know their wickedness. Such obedience, Christ taught, will not suffice to gain an entrance into Heaven. Unless your obedience to the law is more thorough than that, you can in no case enter the kingdom of Heaven. *SITI January 21, 1886, page 40.12*

Here we see the difference between obedience only to the letter and obedience to the spirit of the law. The law is spiritual, and therefore the spirit of it must be obeyed; but some people think on this ground to excuse themselves for disobeying the law. Say they, "The Lord reproved the scribes and Pharisees for their obedience to the letter of the law, therefore we should not think ourselves bound by the letter; if we keep the spirit, that is sufficient." But mark, the Saviour did not say that our righteousness must be entirely different from that of the scribes and Pharisees, but that it must exceed it. To exceed means, "to pass or go beyond;" and by using that word the

Saviour showed that we must keep the law as well as the scribes and Pharisees did, and a great deal better. Not only must the law be kept outwardly, but it must be obeyed from the heart. He did not reprove the Pharisees for refraining from open adultery; but he reproved them for the lust with which their hearts were filled, and which nothing but their love for the applause of men kept them from manifesting openly. Christ did not reprove them because they refrained from actual murder, but because they cherished envy, hatred, and enmity, thus as effectually breaking the sixth commandment as though they had actually taken human life. E. J. W. *SITI January 21, 1886, page 40.13*

(To be continued.)

January 28, 1886

“Nature of the Law (Concluded.)” *The Signs of the Times*, 12, 4.

E. J. Waggoner

(Concluded.)

A moment's thought will show any one the folly of supposing that the law may be kept in spirit and not in letter. Can a man worship gods of gold, or stone, or brass, and yet have a proper regard for the God that made heaven and earth? Can a man blaspheme the name of God, and at the same time have perfect love and reverence in his heart? Is it possible to wantonly violate the letter of the sixth commandment, by taking human life, and yet have no trace of enmity, but only perfect love in the heart? Will a man deliberately and persistently take the goods of others, if he has no covetous desires in his heart? And does not everybody know that the committing of adultery is only the outward manifestation of the lust that burns within? There can be but one answer to these questions. Even so there can be no spiritual obedience without obedience to the letter as well. *SITI January 28, 1886, page 55.1*

The statement of the wise man, that to keep the commandments is the whole duty of man, and of Christ, that whosoever shall do and teach them shall be called great in the kingdom of Heaven, prepares us for the truth stated by the apostle, in *Romans 2:13-SITI January 28, 1886, page 55.2*

“For not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified.” *SITI January 28, 1886, page 55.3*

Since to keep the commandments of God is the whole duty of man, of course the one who keeps the law will be justified; a man can never be justly condemned, when he does his whole duty. We will not, at this time, inquire just how comprehensive the term “the doers of the law” is, nor whether or not there are any such. For the present we shall be content with the truth, which allows of no exception, namely, that “the doers of the law shall be justified.” *SITI January 28, 1886, page 55.4*

In *Romans 6:23* we read that “the wages of sin is death.” But if a man never sins, he will never receive the wages therefor, consequently the doer of the law will live. And this, again, is no more than we find plainly stated in *Romans 10:5*: “For Moses describeth the righteousness which is of the law. That the man which doeth those things shall live by them.” The man whom the law justifies-the one who is really a doer of all its requirements-will certainly live. Now it is a self-evident fact that when God made a perfect, holy, and just law, he designed that all his subjects should obey it. And since the law, when it is kept, gives life, we can see the force of the apostle’s statement, that the law “was ordained to life.” *Romans 7:10*. As we shall hereafter see more fully, the law was given that man might ever keep in harmony with God’s will, in which condition he must necessarily have life. *SITI January 28, 1886, page 55.5*

There is just one more point which we wish to bring out concerning the nature of the law. Let the reader mark it closely; for in the future consideration of this subject it will often be referred to, as it really covers the whole ground; upon it everything else depends. David says (*Psalms 119:172*), “My tongue shall speak of thy word; for all thy commandments are righteousness.” This is really nothing more than is brought out in *Psalms 19:7*, and other texts; but it leads to another text which materially widens the range of our view of the law of God. In *Isaiah 51:6*, we read:-*SITI January 28, 1886, page 55.6*

“Lift up your eyes to the heavens, and look upon the earth beneath; for the heavens shall vanish away like smoke, and the earth shall wax old like a garment, and they that dwell therein shall die in like manner; but my salvation shall be forever, and my righteousness shall not be abolished.” *SITI January 28, 1886, page 55.7*

Abolish the righteousness of God? of course not; but what is the righteousness of God? The very next verse tells us of what the Lord, through his prophet, is here speaking. We proceed: “Hearken unto me, ye that know righteousness, the people in whose heart is my law.” The conclusion to be drawn is very evident. The people who know righteousness are they in whose hearts God’s law is enshrined; they know righteousness, because the law is itself

righteousness (*Psalms 119:172*); and not only is it righteousness in the abstract, but it is the righteousness of God. This is an expression which the apostle Paul often uses in referring to the law. *SITI January 28, 1886, page 55.8*

What an exalted idea of the law of God does this give us! To say that it is perfect may convey various ideas to different persons, for many would be apt to measure the law by their own standard of perfection; but when we learn that it is “the righteousness of God,” we know that it must be infinite in its breadth. The law is a transcript of God’s character, a photograph of character which is infinite in its perfection. It is his nature represented in words, for the benefit of his creatures, so that they may know what is required of them if they would be partakers of the divine nature. God says to man, “Be ye holy, for I am holy.” *1 Peter 1:16*. But without some description of the holiness of God, it would be impossible for man to know how he should order his life; for “the way of man is not in himself; it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps.” *Jeremiah 10:23*. *SITI January 28, 1886, page 55.9*

Since the law is “the righteousness of God”—a brief yet comprehensive description of his character—it may properly be termed the way of the Lord. And so in *Isaiah 55:8, 9*, we have an additional evidence of the exceeding greatness of that law: “For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord. For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts.” The holiness of God’s law is just as much superior to any goodness that man possesses as God is greater than man. The law of God, then, is very justly called his way, and since those who become acquainted with God by walking in the way with him, are at peace (*Job 22:21*), it follows that a proper term for the law is, “the way of peace.” It is the ten commandments, then, to which Paul refers, when, speaking of the universal wickedness of mankind, he says: “Destruction and misery are in their ways, and the way of peace have they not known; there is no fear of God before their eyes.” *Romans 3:16-18*. This idea is still further proved by *Isaiah 48:18*: “O that thou hadst hearkened to my commandment! then had thy peace been as a river, and thy righteousness as the waves of the sea.” *SITI January 28, 1886, page 55.10*

The law of God is also called the truth. "Thy righteousness is an everlasting righteousness, and thy law is the truth." *Psalms 119:142*. It is the very perfection of truth, since it is the expression of God's character. This point is brought out in *Romans 2:17-20*. Paul there says:-*SITI January 28, 1886, page 55.11*

"Behold, thou art called a Jew, and retest in the law, and makest thy boast of God, and knowest his will, and approvest the things that are more excellent, being instructed out of the law; and art confident that thou thyself art a guide of the blind, a light of them which are in darkness, an instructor of the foolish, a teacher of babes, which hast the form of knowledge and of the truth in the law." *SITI January 28, 1886, page 55.12*

In that justly celebrated work, "The Life and Epistles of the Apostle Paul," by Conybeare and Howson, the last clause of the above text is thus rendered: "Possessing in the law the perfect pattern of knowledge and of truth." This accurately describes the law, which is such a perfect pattern of truth that whosoever follows it will live a life of perfect truth. It is because it is perfect truth that it enables the one who is instructed in it to "try the things which differ" (see margin of *verse 18*), or, as Conybeare and Howson render it, to "give judgment upon good or evil." *SITI January 28, 1886, page 55.13*

It is impossible for mortal tongue ever to express, or even for mortal intellect to comprehend the breadth, the beauty, and the perfection of God's law. There is in it abundant food for meditation both day and night; and the more we learn of it, the more we can appreciate the psalmist's glowing descriptions of it, and his exhortations to continually study it. But as man, by searching, can never find out God, so that he can fully comprehend all his attributes, so no man, even when glorified and made immortal, can ever exhaust the law of God. On earth, as we meditate in the law, we can only exclaim, "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out!" and in Heaven, even to the countless ages of eternity, as in the glory of his presence we are permitted to look with unvailed eyes upon Him whose character is portrayed in the ten commandments, our wonder will not cease, and we can only join with the angelic beings that support his throne, in saying, "Holy,

holy, holy, Lord God Almighty.” E. J. W.*SITI January 28, 1886, page*
55.14

February 4, 1886

“Jurisdiction of the Law” *The Signs of the Times*, 12, 5.

E. J. Waggoner

We have already anticipated this division of the subject, and have shown, by the extent of the gospel commission, that the law of God has been known and transgressed by men in every part of the world; that as the gospel is to be preached in all the world until the coming of Christ, sin will exist just as extensively and just as long; and that, consequently, the law, of which sin is the transgression, will be binding in all the world till the end of time. We wish, however, to carry the subject a little further. *SITI February 4, 1886, page 71.1*

The apostle says that “God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself,” and that he has committed the carrying on of this work to his ambassadors—the ministers of the gospel—who, in Christ’s stead, pray the world to be reconciled to God. *2 Corinthians 5:19, 20*. Now, reconciliation implies a previous condition of enmity; and if the world needed reconciling to God, it was because the world was at enmity with God. And since the work of reconciling is still being carried on, it follows that the rebellion, or enmity, still exists. Then the question arises, In what does that enmity consist? The same apostle tells us: “Because the carnal mind is enmity against God; *for it is not subject to the law* of God, neither indeed can be.” *Romans 8:7*. Men are rebels, because they are in opposition to God’s law. And this is the same truth that had been uttered, centuries before, by the inspired prophet: “Now go, write it before them in a table, and note it in a book, that it may be for the time to come for ever and ever; that this is *a rebellious people*, lying children, children *that will not hear the law of the Lord.*” *Isaiah 30:8, 9. SITI February 4, 1886, page 71.2*

This brings out again the fact previously stated, that the gospel announces, and carries on its forefront, the law. It was the transgression of the law that made it necessary for Christ to come to reconcile men to God. And as men, by continued sin, lost their sense of its heinousness, and of their obligation to God, it became more and more necessary that the gospel, in announcing to men the way of pardon and reconciliation, should make known their

need of such reconciliation and pardon by setting forth, in plain terms, the law which they had transgressed. This is what is plainly stated by Peter, when, after quoting Isaiah's tribute to the enduring nature of the law, "For all flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass. The grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth away; but the word of the Lord endureth forever," he adds, "And *this* is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you." 1 *Peter* 1:24, 25. *SITI February 4, 1886, page 71.3*

The quotations made from John Wesley and Bishop Simpson are in harmony with this conclusion. Indeed, the conclusion is so nearly self-evident that it must be reached by all thoughtful, candid minds. The very fact that a pardon is granted, attests the authority of the law; and before a pardon can be granted, the individual must know and acknowledge his guilt. If a man thinks himself righteous, he will indignantly spurn any offer of pardon, even though he may really stand in need of it. Human nature would leave such to the fate which their own blindness and stubbornness deserve; but God loves the world, and desires that all men shall accept his pardon, and thus be reconciled to him; and therefore he takes pains to bring men to a sense of their sinful condition, so that the pardon which he offers may be accepted. The same messenger who is commissioned to announce the pardon, proclaims the law of God, which awakens the self-confident sinner, so that he may appreciate his lost condition. *SITI February 4, 1886, page 71.4*

Let us look still further into the matter of the extent of the law's jurisdiction. Read *Romans* 3:19: "Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law: that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God." The law speaks only to those who are within the bounds of its jurisdiction; it cannot condemn any who may walk contrary to its provisions, if they are outside of its limits. For example, a man in Russia may commit an act which is forbidden by the laws of the United States; yet he cannot on that account be declared guilty, simply because the United States law has no jurisdiction in his case. He is not amenable to it. But as a consequence of what the law of God says, all the world are found guilty before him. This, again, shows conclusively that all the world are in duty bound to keep God's law. *SITI February 4, 1886, page*

There are no exceptions to this fact. We have before learned that “sin is the transgression of the law” (1 John 3:4) and that “where no law is, there is no transgression” (Romans 4:15); and therefore we know that wherever we find sin, there must also be the law. To whomsoever sin is imputed, upon him the law has claims; for “sin is not imputed when there is no law.” Romans 5:13. Now we find these statements in the third of Romans: “What then? Are we better than they? No, in no wise; for we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles, that they are all under sin; as it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one;” “For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God.” Verses 9, 10, 23. Here the apostle descends to particulars, and shows that not to the Jews alone, but to Gentiles as well, is sin imputed, thus proving beyond all controversy that the Gentiles as well as the Jews are under the jurisdiction of the law of God, and have violated it. *SITI February 4, 1886, page 72.2*

Our investigation of the law began with the time when it was given on Mount Sinai; and we must therefore now examine to see if that was the first of its existence. And here, as in all our study of the law, we find help from our knowledge of the fact that the law is “the righteousness of God.” Then it must necessarily have been in existence before the exode. Since it is a transcript of God’s character, it necessarily follows that its existence is coeval with the existence of God. *SITI February 4, 1886, page 72.3*

“But,” it may be objected, “the law, as a manifestation of God’s righteousness, might exist, without being transcribed for the government of mankind.” So it might if there were no creatures to whom it could be made known; or if there was any time after creatures had been brought into existence when God did not exercise government over them. But it is not for us to speculate on the state of affairs when God dwelt alone, inhabiting his own eternity, before the existence even of the “sons of God” that shouted for joy at the creation of this earth; and there certainly has never been a time since intelligent creatures were formed, either in Heaven or on earth, when God was not supreme ruler. No created beings have ever been independent of his control. But if God has always been ruler, he must have had some rule of government, and

that could be nothing else than his righteousness-his law. The ten commandments are righteousness; they are perfect, holy, just, and good, and therefore exactly fitted to be the rule of a righteous and just government. Then, from the very nature of the law we would conclude that it was binding on men before it was spoken from Mount Sinai. We shall shortly recur to the argument broached in this paragraph; but first we wish to show from positive evidence that the law of ten commandments was known by men, and was binding on them, before the giving of it on Sinai.*SITI February 4, 1886, page 72.4*

In *Romans 5:12*, we read that “by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned.” Here the apostle shows that death is a consequence of sin; death came into the world because there was sin in the world. If there had been no sin, there would have been no death, and wherever death is found, it is positive evidence that sin exists. With this passage we may well place *1 Corinthians 15:56*: “The sting of death is sin; and the strength of sin is the law.” Here death is represented as a cruel monster that has brought many people into its power. It has poisonous fangs with which it strikes its victims, and these fangs, this sting, is sin. Let the fangs be drawn,-let sin be obliterated,-and death’s power would be gone. But the “strength of sin is the law.” “Sin is the transgression of the law,” and it is the violated law which provides death with its powerful sting. Were it not for the law, death would have no sting, that is, it would be powerless to destroy. So here, again, we have proof that wherever death is, there is the law also.*SITI February 4, 1886, page 72.5*

We read on: “For until the law sin was in the world: but sin is not imputed when there is no law. Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam’s transgression, who is the figure of him that was to come.” *Romans 5:13, 14*. Here we have the statement that until the law, that is, until the time of Moses, when it was spoken from Sinai, sin and death were in the world; therefore we know that the law was in the world. And hereby we know that the expression, “until the law,” does not indicate that the time so specified was the first existence of the law; for both sin and death were in the world

before that time, and neither can exist without the law, and the law violated.*SITI February 4, 1886, page 72.6*

Let us go still further into particulars. "Sin is the transgression of the law" (1 *John* 3:4), and "sin is not imputed when there is no law." *Romans* 5:13. But sin was imputed to Cain (*Genesis* 4:7, 8), and consequently the law was there to condemn. Turn to the commandments, and you will find that the sixth commandment was the one especially transgressed.*SITI February 4, 1886, page 72.7*

Again we read that "the men of Sodom were wicked and sinners before the Lord exceedingly." *Genesis* 13:13. "Sin is not imputed when there is no law," and consequently we know that God judged the Sodomites by his law. If he judged them by his law, of course they knew of the existence of that law; otherwise their punishment would not have been just; but we may be sure that the "Judge of all the earth" will do right.*SITI February 4, 1886, page 72.8*

Take the case of the sons of Noah (*Genesis* 9:22-26). Here we have direct evidence that the fifth commandment was known; that it was violated by Ham, the younger son of Noah, and kept by the other two; and that the one was cursed for his sin, while the others were blessed for their observance of the commandment. These things show the existence of that commandment, a knowledge of its existence, and also a knowledge that it was in full force to condemn the guilty and to acquit the innocent.*SITI February 4, 1886, page 72.9*

We find also the violation of the eighth commandment mentioned in *Genesis* 31:30. It is not necessary to particularize concerning each of the commandments, but we will notice one more. In *Genesis* 15:15, 16, we read these words of the Lord to Abraham: "And thou shalt go to thy fathers in peace; thou shalt be buried in a good old age. But in the fourth generation they shall come hither again; for the iniquity of the Amorites is not yet full." This shows that in the days of Abraham, the inhabitants of Canaan, the Gentiles, were guilty of iniquity. Iniquity is sin, and "sin is the transgression of the law;" so, therefore, the Amorites had the law of God. Turn now to 1 *Kings* 21:25, 26, and you will learn of what the Amorites were guilty:-*SITI February 4, 1886, page 72.10*

“But there was none like unto Ahab, which did sell himself to work wickedness in the sight of the Lord, whom Jezebel his wife stirred up. And he did very abominably in following idols, according to all things as did the Amorites, whom the Lord cast out before the children of Israel.” *SITI February 4, 1886, page 72.11*

Here we find that the Amorites were cast out of Canaan because of idolatry,-idolatry, which, in its rites, involved the violation of not only the first and second commandments, but of all the ten. So we find that all the commandments were known and violated hundreds of years before the Jews came to Mount Sinai, and before there ever was a Jew. The point has now been proved, both from the nature of the law and by actual illustrations of the fact. E. J. W. *SITI February 4, 1886, page 72.12*

(To be continued.)

February 11, 1886

“Jurisdiction of the Law. (Continued)” *The Signs of the Times*, 12, 6.

E. J. Waggoner

Thus far we have shown the existence of the law of God from the earliest history of mankind. We wish now to carry the argument a step further, as we have already intimated that we should do. We have found the law to be “the righteousness of God,” the rule of his government. Since God has always been supreme ruler, and his rule has always been just and righteous, he must have judged only by his own righteous character, which is embodied in the decalogue. Now God has created many worlds besides this one (*Hebrews 1:2*), and since he formed ours that it might be inhabited (*Isaiah 45:18*), the conclusion is legitimate, in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, that he made the others for the same purpose. No thinking person can suppose that this little earth, one of the smallest among the innumerable planets of the universe, is the only one that is inhabited. Now of all these vast worlds, God is the King. “The Lord hath prepared his throne in the Heavens; and his kingdom ruleth over all.” *Psalms 103:19*. And since he can rule by naught except justice and righteousness, and all righteousness, even the righteousness of God himself, is comprised within the ten commandments, it follows that they, and they alone, form the rule of action in all God’s universe. Of the correctness of this conclusion we have direct evidence in *Psalms 103:20*, where we read that the angels “do his commandments, hearkening unto the voice of his word.” If the commandments are the rule in Heaven, where God himself resides, certainly they are the rule “in all places of his dominion.” *SITI February 11, 1886, page 87.1*

This view of the law, and we are confident that it is a just view, lifts the law question far, far above the plane on which its opposers would fain confine it. Instead of being imperfect and not calculated to bring man into proper relation to his Maker, it is the righteousness of God; instead of being confined to a small portion of this earth, the bounds of its jurisdiction are as extensive as the universe; instead of being given to one nation of earth, and to that alone, it is that to which all loyal creatures, even the angels of

Heaven, bow in humble allegiance; and instead of being limited to a few centuries of existence, it “stands fast forever and ever,” even as long as God exists and his kingdom ruleth over all.*SITI February 11, 1886, page 87.2*

We are aware that at first sight many will think that this is going too far, and will possibly raise objections, and say that when we consider the nature of certain commandments, it is not reasonable to suppose that they could be in Heaven for the restraint of heavenly beings. We will therefore add one or two more points. But first we would remark that when a case is supported by positive evidence, we are not at liberty to reject it because there are points about it which we do not understand. Nothing can be proved so clearly that no one can raise an *objection*, or even frame an argument, against it; and many things that are susceptible of the clearest proof, cannot be fully comprehended even by those who present the proof. Take, for instance, the question of the existence of God. Both nature and revelation plainly teach that there is a God, who has existed from eternity; yet it is impossible to state the case so clearly that no one can cavil or raise objections; and there is no one, no matter how clearly he can demonstrate that there is a God, who can comprehend him, or understand how he could exist from eternity. The argument from ignorance is no argument at all. Truth is truth, however great our ignorance of it may be. The merchant sitting in his office can put a question to his agent a thousand miles distant, and receive a reply the next minute. Tell this well-known fact to a savage, and he will not believe you; he cannot comprehend how such a thing can be done, and will present objections and arguments which, to his mind, show the utter impossibility of such a thing. Yet in spite of his ignorance, the thing is true. So there are many things in connection with God and his government which finite wisdom cannot explain, but which we must accept.*SITI February 11, 1886, page 87.3*

Now to further show the reasonableness, nay, the absolute necessity, of the ten commandments existing as a rule for all creatures of the universe,*SITI February 11, 1886, page 87.4*

1. “The law of the Lord is perfect.” *Psalms 19:7*. Since it is perfect, nothing can be added to it or taken from it without making it

imperfect. If, then, any creatures should be governed by more or less than this law, they would be governed by an imperfect law. But that, of course, would result in imperfect characters, and would further show the lawgiver to be imperfect; therefore such an idea cannot be entertained. *SITI February 11, 1886, page 87.5*

2. "The law of the Lord is perfect," because it is a transcript of his will, his righteousness. Therefore all intelligent creatures must be governed by it. This has already been stated, but it will bear repetition. Too much stress cannot be laid upon it. Wherever God rules, his will must of necessity be law. That the ten commandment law, the law out of which the Jews were instructed, is the will of God, Paul shows in *Romans 2:17, 18*: "Behold, thou art called a Jew, and retest in the law, and makest thy boast of God, And knowest his will, and approvest the things that are more excellent [margin, triest the things that differ], *being instructed out of the law.*" That the ten commandments are here referred to, may be seen from *verses 21-23*. Paul, therefore, speaking to a Jew, said, You know the will of God, because you are instructed out of the law. No further evidence is needed to show that the ten commandments are the will of God. Now, since all intelligent creatures must be governed by the will of God, it is evident that they are governed by the ten commandments, unless it could be shown that God changes, having one will at one time and toward one people, and another will at another time and for another people. But this cannot be; for "with him is no variableness, neither shadow of turning." *James 1:17*. There is, then, one law for all. *SITI February 11, 1886, page 87.6*

3. There are none who can have a greater interest than the righteous whether of the redeemed or of those who never sinned, in having the ten commandments maintained as the standard of right. And this for the very reason that it is the standard of right. It is the badge of their loyalty. If there were a place where the ten commandments were not held as the law, the righteous ones would not want to go there; for there would be nothing to show that they were righteous. But enough has been said to prove beyond a reasonable doubt the universality of God's holy law. In all places of God's dominion, rational beings are by this law either justified or condemned. E. J. W. *SITI February 11, 1886, page 87.7*

(To be continued.)

“Faith Healing” The Signs of the Times, 12, 6.

E. J. Waggoner

The question as to the propriety of the praying for the recovery of the sick, and of depending on the prayer of faith for the healing of disease, has of late been discussed very much, by both the secular and religious press. On the one hand, the infidel and the worldling scoff at the idea of expecting the recovery of those whose diseases will not respond to the action of the medicinal agents known to science. To them such a thing seems an impossibility, an absurdity. The cause of this incredulity is found in *1 Corinthians 2:14*. On the other hand there are those who read *James 5:13-15*, and declaim that all the remedial agents known to the medical profession should be thrown aside, and that in every disease the patient should rely on prayer alone for his recovery. *SITI February 11, 1886, page 87.8*

These are the two extremes; the first was well represented by Mr. Tyndall, who several years ago proposed to test the efficacy of prayer by an experiment. He proposed to set apart two wards in a hospital; the patients in one to be treated by the ordinary remedies, and those in the other to be prayed for. This impious and foolish proposal was, for obvious reasons, declined by the Christian world. As an instance of the other extreme, we may cite the case of the young man belonging to the missionary company that Bishop Wm. Taylor recently conducted to Africa. Being taken with one of the fevers incident to that climate, he utterly refused to make use of any means for his recovery, but, as he said, trusted himself entirely in the hands of the Lord, believing that his faith would insure his restoration to health. In vain the Bishop urged him to adopt the simple remedies which proved successful in other cases similarly afflicted, and the young man died. *SITI February 11, 1886, page 87.9*

We most heartily believe in the power of God to heal the sick, that he has often done so in answer to the professor of faith, and that he does so still; but at the same time we believe that those who discard all remedial agents, and establish what they term “faith

cures," i.e., places where all the sick who have faith may come to be healed by prayer alone, bring the cause of religion into disrepute. The position of the modern "faith cures" advocates may be summed up to about as follows: 1. Disease of the body corresponds to disease of the soul, and if cured at all, must be cured in the same manner that sins are forgiven, viz., by faith alone; 2. All disease may be cured if we have faith; 3. We must trust the Lord for the healing of all our ailments, without using any material remedies. And therefore, (1) The use of any remedial agency is a manifestation of a lack of faith; and (2) If we call on the Lord in faith, without having first employed remedies, we have a right in every instance to expect, and even to demand a cure. The folly of such a position may be readily seen by a consideration of the Scriptural position, to which we will now proceed. *SITI February 11, 1886, page 87.10*

We will first cite as a parallel the instruction found in the Bible concerning the provision for the nourishment of our bodies when in health. In the sermon on the mount, Christ said: "Take no thought for your life, of what ye shall eat or what ye shall drink; nor yet the for your body, what ye shall put on. Is not the life more than meat, and the body than raiment?" "Therefore take no thought, saying, What shall be eaten? or, What shall we drink? or, Wherewithal shall we be closed? for heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things." *Matthew 6:25, 31, 32*. Now an extremest might say, "It is wrong for me to work for my living; God knows what I need, and he will see that I am provided for, if I only exercise faith, and do not try to do anything for myself." So he folds his hands in idleness, and perhaps starves to death. What is this? What is there wrong in this interpretation of Scripture? Simply this: He has been too hasty in his conclusion, and has not taken into the account that other inspired declaration that, "if any would not work, neither should eat." *2 Thessalonians 3:10. SITI February 11, 1886, page 87.11*

A proper interpretation of Scripture takes into the account the various texts bearing on a given point, and then draws a legitimate conclusion from the whole. As bearing on the question of living, we quote the following: "Let him that stole steal no more; but rather let him labor, *working with his hands* the thing which is good, that he may have to give to him that needeth." *Ephesians 4:28*. "We

beseech you, brethren, ... that ye study to be quiet, and to do your own business, and to work with your own hands, as we commanded you: that ye may walk honestly toward them that are without, and that ye may have lack of nothing." *1 Thessalonians 4:10-12*. A very plain intimation that if they do not work they will lack the necessities of life. Again Paul says: "But if any provide not for his own, and, specially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel." *1 Timothy 5:8*. *SITI February 11, 1886, page 88.1*

Now is there any lack of harmony between these texts and *Matthew 6:25*? Not a particle. Read now *Deuteronomy 8:18*: "But thou shalt remember the Lord thy God; for is he that giveth thee power to get wealth." Read the context, from the *10th verse* onward, and you will see that all the texts which we have quoted are bound together. Men are to work with their hands for their support; but they are still to give the credit to God, because he gives them the power and the opportunity to labor. If God gives a man the ability to work, and then orders circumstances so that he has an opportunity to work, the honor belongs to God. Thus it is that God supports us. And knowing that "the Lord will provide," we are not to worry and fret over the future, as though the Lord had no interest in us. *SITI February 11, 1886, page 88.2*

There are cases, however, in which is beyond the power of man to secure provision by his own labor. In such cases the Lord has worked a direct miracle, as in the case of the Israelites in the wilderness, and Elijah by the brook Chereth and in the desert. What God has done for the support of his people, we may be sure he will do again under similar circumstances, for his promise cannot fail; but from a careful examination of Scripture it certainly appears that we are not warranted in expecting the Lord to work a direct miracle for support, so long as it is possible for us to provide for ourselves by using the means which is ordained. Such an expectation is not in accordance with God's word, and hence is not faith. *SITI February 11, 1886, page 88.3*

Now it seems to us that the same principle that governs the support of the body when in health must be acted upon in seeking a restoration of it to health, when it is diseased. This can best be

proved by citing typical instances of healing, as recorded in the Bible. By so doing we shall find that the cases where God has directly interposed to heal people by a miracle, were cases that were beyond the reach of human skill.*SITI February 11, 1886, page 88.4*

In the first place we have a record of many who were raised from the dead. Here, of course, human agency was of no avail.*SITI February 11, 1886, page 88.5*

Entering into particulars, we not the case of the young man who was born blind. *John 9*. In his case it was not thought worth while even to seek for a cure; for, as the young man said, "Since the world began was it not heard that any man opened the eyes of one that was born blind if this man [Christ] were not of God, he could do nothing." *John 9:32, 33.**SITI February 11, 1886, page 88.6*

Again, we read of a woman with the issue of blood, who was healed by touching the hem of Christ's garment. She had been afflicted for twelve years, "and had suffered many things of many physicians, and had spent all that she had, and was nothing better, but rather grew worse." *Mark 5:26*. The "beloved physician" says that she "had spent all her living upon physicians, neither could be healed of any." *Luke 8:43.**SITI February 11, 1886, page 88.7*

Take the case of the nobleman's son he was "at the point of death." The case was very urgent; for when Jesus was testing the man's faith, the father cried out, "Sir, come down ere my child die." *John 4:49*. He felt that Jesus alone had power to check the fever.*SITI February 11, 1886, page 88.8*

The man at the pool of Bethesda had been unable to walk for thirty-eight years. *John 5:2-9*. He was unable even to make the attempt to make use of the remedy that was supposed to be able to reach his case. He was healed by the word of the Lord.*SITI February 11, 1886, page 88.9*

Indeed the third of Acts we have the account of the man whom Peter healed at the gate of the temple. He had never walked, and no means known to man could enable him to walk. The healing of this man was admitted, even by the scoffing Jews, to be "a notable

miracle.”*SITI February 11, 1886, page 88.10*

Take the case of the stilling of the tempest, recorded in *Matthew 8:24-26* and *Luke 8:22-25*. Here, when the men were unable to manage the boat on account of the violence of the sea, and were about to perish, Christ stilled the winds and waves with a word.*SITI February 11, 1886, page 88.11*

When Jesus miraculously fed the 4,000 men, besides the women and children, it was because they had eaten nothing for three days, and were in the wilderness, where it was impossible to find food for such a vast multitude. More than this, they had not sufficient strength to go to the villages to buy food, and doubtless but few of them had money, had they been able to go.*SITI February 11, 1886, page 88.12*

To all these cases might be added the numerous instances of the cleansing of lepers who had been cast out as incurable, the healing of the deaf and dumb, and the casting out of devils. In every case the direct power of Heaven was interposed after the means known to mortals had failed.*SITI February 11, 1886, page 88.13*

The case of Peter’s mother-in-law might be cited by some as a case where Jesus healed a curable disease. But no one knows that this fever could be cured. Indeed. The probabilities are, rather, that, as in the case of the nobleman’s son, they had been unable to check the fever by ordinary means.*SITI February 11, 1886, page 88.14*

There is another class of cases that may be thought to contradict the position above taken. These are the cases where persons whom God has employed in a special manner in his service, have been healed in answer to prayer when there was urgent need of their immediate attendance upon certain duties connected with the Lord’s work. Persons have been healed of ailments that *possibly* might in time have been removed by medical skill, if it had been employed. But these cases are in reality the same as the others; for there was certainly no human skill that could heal them in the brief space of time that the circumstances demanded.*SITI February 11, 1886, page 88.15*

Again we notice that in many cases where miracles of healing were

performed, the sufferers were required to do something before their cure was effected. Namaan the Syrian was required to wash seven times in the Jordan. *2 Kings 5:1-14*. The blind man of whom John writes, after having his eyes anointed with clay and spittle, was told to go and wash in the pool of Siloam, and then he received his sight. Now whatever effect these washings had, it is safe to say that if those individuals had not employed the means provided they would not have been healed. Thus we see that God has provided remedies that will with his blessing accomplish the restoration of the sick to health, and he has made it possible for men to obtain a limited knowledge of these remedies. Now when those heaven-ordained remedies are within our reach, for us to expect to get well when we refuse to make use of them, is a manifestation not of faith, but of presumption. The case is exactly parallel to one who, having health and strength, should fold his hands and expect the Lord to feed him. *SITI February 11, 1886, page 88.16*

But the worst presumption comes in when men establish what they call "faith cures," where, as they advertise, all people may come to be prayed for and healed. This is a reversing the true order of things, instead of being content to be instruments in the hands of God, such ones presume to make God an instrument in their hands, and to manipulate him to suit their own interests. *SITI February 11, 1886, page 88.17*

It is entirely a mistake to try to make a strict parallel between sickness, disease of the body, and sin, disease of the soul. Men can do nothing whatever to secure the forgiveness of sin, except to believe in the merits of Christ. There are no means provided, no works, by which a man may cleanse himself from sin. But there are means provided by which he can remove certain forms of disease. Again, God has not promised to instantly heal all cases of disease; but he will at once forgive the sins of any who come to him in faith. But in every case of healing, whether of the body or of the soul, the praise rightfully belongs to God. "It is of the Lord's mercies that we are not consumed." *Lamentations 3:22. SITI February 11, 1886, page 88.18*

Once more: Everything must tend to the glory of God. All things are for his pleasure, and he is worthy to receive all honor, and glory,

and blessing. *Revelation 4:11*. Now it is not always for his glory that even his most devoted servants should be freed from disease. Paul's "thorn in the flesh" was not removed, although he thrice besought the Lord that it might depart from him. Therefore he gloried in infirmities, that the power of Christ might rest upon him. Sometimes Christ is glorified by the patient's suffering, or even by the death, of his faithful followers, and therefore the Christian should pray that he may recover if it will be for the glory of God. "Not has I will, but as thou wilt." We do not always know what will be for the best. We are zealous to work for the Lord; and when we are afflicted we feel like a prisoner of war, who, in his anxiety to be in the battle, beats against his prison bars. We are in danger of imagining that the Lord needs us in the field, forgetting that he knows best, and may require us to serve him in affliction, and that he can get along without any of our service. Milton solved the problem, when, having been smitten with blindness in the midst of his career, he wrote:-*SITI February 11, 1886, page 88.19*

"When I consider how my light is spent
Ere half my days, in this dark world and wide;
And that one talent which is death to hide,
Lodged with me useless, though my soul more bent
To serve therewith my Maker, and present
My true account, lest he returning chide;
Doth God exact day-labor, light denied?
I fondly ask. But Patience, to prevent
That murmur, soon replies, God doth not need
Either man's work or his own gifts; who best
Bear his mild yoke, they serve him best; his state
Is kingly; thousand at his bidding speed,
And post o'er land and ocean without rest;
They also serve who only stand and wait."*SITI February 11, 1886, page 88.20*

If the position of many so-called "holiness" people and the modern "faith cure" advocates were true, that we may at once be healed of all disease if we will but exercise faith, then Christians would not all be practically immortal. There would be no death. But immortality is not promised to any one until the coming of the Lord and the resurrection. See *Luke 20:35, 36; 1 Corinthians 15:51-54*, etc. At

that time “the eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped. Then shall the lame man leap as a hart, and the tongue of the dumb sing.” *Isaiah 35:5, 6*. Of the new earth it is said, “And the inhabitant shall not say, I am sick; the people that dwelt therein shall be forgiven their iniquity.” *Isaiah 33:24*. And then, when all things shall have been made new, and the people of God have been redeemed from destruction, we will find the complete fulfillment of *Psalms 103:2-4*: “Bless the Lord, O my soul, and forget not all his benefits; who forgiveth all thine iniquities; who healeth all thy diseases; who redeemeth thy life from destruction; who crowneth thee with loving-kindness and tender mercies.” Compare this with *Isaiah 33:24*. *SITI February 11, 1886, page 88.21*

It is a favorite saying with a man that “God helps them who help themselves.” This is true; but there is something else that is equally true, and that is that God helps those who are not able to help themselves. And while his protecting care is continually over us, blessing the means which we employ for the preservation or the recovery of our strength, it is not till we are brought where the resources which we have at hand utterly fail that God miraculously exhibits his power; and then only when he will be glorified in so doing. As is often said, “Man’s extremity is God’s opportunity.” “He giveth power to the faint; and to them that have no might he increaseth strength.” *Isaiah 40:29*. E. J. W. *SITI February 11, 1886, page 89.1*

February 18, 1886

“Jurisdiction of the Law. (Continued).” *The Signs of the Times*, 12, 7.

E. J. Waggoner

(Continued).

While we have been making the claim and proving it, that the law of God covers every possible act or thought, and that no responsible being is outside of its jurisdiction, some one has been looking for the verse which says that the Gentiles do not have the law, but are a law unto themselves. Perhaps this is as good a time as any to consider that text. An answer to it will also involve the consideration of the question why the ten commandments, since they have such universal jurisdiction, were spoken from Mount Sinai only to the Jews. Let us now read the passage above referred to. *SITI February 18, 1886, page 103.1*

“For as many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law: and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law; (for not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified. For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves; which show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one another.)” *Romans 2:12-15. SITI February 18, 1886, page 103.2*

A brief examination of Paul’s argument in this chapter will be necessary in order to get a proper understanding of this text. It will be noticed that the *13th, 14th, and 15th verses* are parenthetical, and are therefore secondary to the main argument. Therefore in stating the argument, we shall omit those three verses. In the first chapter of Romans, Paul has shown the terribly immoral condition of the heathen world; and in the second chapter he proceeds to show that whoever condemns the heathen, condemns himself; for all are guilty. God, he says, “will render *to every man* according to his deeds.” To those who patiently persevere in well-doing, he will

render eternal life; but to those who are contentious, and do not obey the truth (see *Psalms* 119:142), he will render indignation and wrath. And these rewards of good or ill will be rendered to every man, whether he be Jew or Gentile. "For there is no respect of persons with God. For as many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law; and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law; in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ according to my gospel." *SITI February 18, 1886, page 103.3*

In the first two chapters of Romans, the apostle brings out the fact which is plainly stated in the third, that "both Jews and Gentiles" are "under sin," and that "there is none righteous, no, not one." In the passage under consideration, he states that, as a consequence, all who do not repent shall suffer "the righteous judgment of God, who will render to every man according to his deeds." This will be done without regard to nationality; "for there is no respect of persons with God;" that is, it is not a man's birth, but his character, that gives him favor with God. It is the *doers of the law* whom he justifies, whether they be Jews or Gentiles, and not those who, as did many of the Jews, hear the law, but do not obey. All who sin, whether with the law or without it, shall perish. *SITI February 18, 1886, page 103.4*

In the *12th and 14th verses*, we have the two classes brought to view—those who have the law, and those who have it not. There is no question but that the Jews had the law; they rested in it (*Romans* 2:17), and by breaking it dishonored God. *Verses 23, 24*. And the *14th verse* tells us plainly that those not having the law are the Gentiles. Before considering their case, we must not fail to note the fact that both the Jews who had the law, and the Gentiles who had it not, had sinned. They were alike guilty before God. *Romans* 3:9, 10. Now "sin is the transgression of the law" (*1 John* 3:4), and "where no law is, there is no transgression." *Romans* 4:15. Therefore it is beyond controversy that both classes here mentioned had transgressed law, and more than that, had been conscious of the fact; for "sin is not imputed when there is no law." So it is certain that the Gentiles had transgressed the law; yet the text says they had not the law, and that they "sinned without law." How shall we explain this seeming contradiction? Let us see. Read again *verses 14, 15*:-*SITI February 18, 1886, page 103.5*

“For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves; which show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one another.” *SITI February 18, 1886, page 103.6*

When God made man in his own image, he made him upright. *Ecclesiastes 7:29*. Not alone in his physical form, but also in his moral nature, he was in the image of God. While Adam continued in this upright, sinless condition, the law of God was in his heart. We know this from *Psalms 40:8*, where David, speaking for the Messiah, says, “I delight to do thy will, O my God; yea, thy law is within my heart.” The existence of the law of God in the heart is manifested by the willingness to obey that law; and he who, as was the case with Christ, has the law perfectly formed within his heart, will render perfect obedience to the law. This was the case with our first parents in the garden of Eden. *SITI February 18, 1886, page 103.7*

But man fell from his high estate; he sinned against God, and thus marred the perfect copy of the law which had existed in his heart. The tendency of sin is to multiply itself; like the tares sown among the good grain, it will grow without any attention. So the first sin prepared the way for many more, till at last nearly all the world became wholly given up to sin. In *Hebrews 3:13*, the apostle says that men become “hardened through the deceitfulness of sin;” that is, the more men sin, the less heinous does sin appear to them, until at last evil appears to be only good, and good evil, and they sin without the slightest compunction of conscience. This principle is something with which everybody is familiar. Now this progressive love of sin, and the indifference to it, is nothing else than the obliterating of the copy of the law which exists in a more or less perfect state in every heart. This work is not done instantaneously; it takes time for men to so completely obliterate the law from their hearts that they will feel no restraint. But when it is entirely gone, then man is in the condition in which he was just prior to the flood, when “every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually.” *Genesis 6:5*. So long, however, as any portion remains in the heart, the Spirit is enabled to strive with man, and, by means of that law, to convict of sin; and this whether the individual knows

anything of the written revelation or not.*SITI February 18, 1886, page 103.8*

Now the Gentiles did not have the law written on stone and in books, as did the Jews; they only had that portion which still remained unobliterated from their hearts. Of course the Jews, having much more light than the Gentiles had, were far more responsible. The former would necessarily be judged by the fullness of the law; for they could not plead ignorance of any portion of it. If they sinned, justice required that the condemnation of the law should be visited upon them in full measure. But the Gentiles could be judged only by the light that they had. Since they had not the written revelation, that, of course, would not be brought up against them. They knew, however, the difference, in many things, between right and wrong; and by this they are judged. Had they lived fully up to the light which they had by nature, they would have been counted as doers of the law; but since they did not, since their own conscience condemned them, they must suffer the consequences. The Jews, having the written law, are judged by the law; and the Gentiles, not having the written law, perish without being brought into Judgment by it.*SITI February 18, 1886, page 103.9*

Perhaps this can be made plainer by illustration. The Jews had every one of the ten commandments in such shape that they could constantly be reminded of them, and know the extent of their claims. Now when they came into Judgment, it is no more than justice that the whole law should be held up before them, that the enormity of their guilt may be manifest. But here is a poor, ignorant barbarian, who, we will suppose, knew by the light of nature, only two precepts of the law,—that it is wrong to kill and to commit adultery. His knowledge of the sinfulness of those acts is shown by his trying to conceal the fact when he has done one or the other of them. His own conscience accuses him. Now it is not necessary, in order to convict him of sin, that the whole ten commandments be held up beside the record of his life. In the Judgment let the two precepts with which he was familiar be recalled to his mind. By these alone he stands condemned as a sinner; and since “the wages of sin is death,” he justly perishes, without ever having seen the written law. Thus we see that all men, whatever their condition, are amenable to, and are to be judged by, the law of God. When

Paul says that the Gentiles have not the law, he means that they had not the written revelation, but not that they did not have some knowledge of right and wrong, as defined by the moral law. E. J. W. *SITI February 18, 1886, page 104.1*

(To be continued.)

“What Is Faith?” The Signs of the Times, 12, 7.

E. J. Waggoner

This question presented itself very forcibly to our mind a few days ago, when we read in a religious paper the following quotation from an eminent minister: “Faith is the true anesthesia of the soul.” We do not propose to enter into a fine-spun theological discussion as to the exact definition of faith, but simply to cite a few instances of true faith, that we may see how the possession of it affects people. *SITI February 18, 1886, page 104.2*

Let us first get the meaning of the quotation. An anesthetic is something which is administered to produce insensibility, so that surgical operations may be performed without pain to the patient. Anesthesia is the state of insensibility which is produced by the administration of an anesthetic. The meaning of the quotation, then, is that faith is that condition in which the soul has no sensibility, no consciousness. That is, it is a state in which the individual feels perfectly secure, having no care for surrounding circumstances. *SITI February 18, 1886, page 104.3*

“Now faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen.” *Hebrews 11:1*. Faith is active; it is keenly alive to all the dangers that surround, yet is confident, because it has a clear perception of certain evidence. Take the case of Caleb and Joshua. When the ten spies brought back an evil report, and said, “We be not able to go up against the people; for they are stronger than we,” these two men said, “Let us go up at once, and possess it; for we are well able to overcome it.” *Numbers 13:26-33*. Was it because Caleb and Joshua did not understand the danger, that they were so confident? No; they had seen the walled cities, and the giants, before whom they were as grasshoppers. But they had

faith in God. They said; "If the Lord delight in us, then he will bring us into this land, and give it us; ... and the Lord is with us; fear them not." *Numbers 14:8, 9*. This was true faith.*SITI February 18, 1886, page 104.4*

When David went forth to answer the challenge of Goliath, he knew that the giant had for forty days defied the army of Israel. He did not in the least underestimate the giant's strength and skill. But he believed that the One who had delivered him in his encounters with the wild beasts of the forest, would help him now. So the stripling went boldly toward the giant, saying, "Thou comest to me with a sword, and with a spear, and with a shield; but I come to thee in the name of the Lord of hosts, the God of the armies of Israel, whom thou hast defied. This day will the Lord deliver thee into mine hand; and I will smite thee, and take thine head from thee; and I will give the carcasses of the host of the Philistines this day unto the fowls of the air, and to the wild beasts of the earth; that all the earth may know that there is a God in Israel." *1 Samuel 17:45, 46*. David knew the power of the giant; but he believed the evidence which he had received, that the Lord is stronger than all, and willing to help those who trust him. This was true faith.*SITI February 18, 1886, page 104.5*

But it is worthy of note, that although David said to Goliath, "This day will the Lord deliver thee into mine hand," he did not sit down and wait for the Lord to deliver the giant into his hands. He made use of the means which the Lord had provided, believing that the Lord would bless them.*SITI February 18, 1886, page 104.6*

Take the case of Paul on his sea-voyage to Rome. Among the two hundred and seventy-six souls on board the vessel, Paul alone was calm and unmoved amid the terrible tempest. Could it be that he was insensible to the danger? By no means. He had many times been on the sea, and he realized the danger of the situation better than any one else did. When the sailors thought the prospect was favorable, Paul had told them that the voyage would end disastrously. *Acts 27:9-11*. What was the source of his courage? Hear his words to the passengers and crew: "There shall be no loss of any man's life among you, but of the ship. For there stood by me this night the angel of God, whose I am, and whom I serve, Saying,

Fear not, Paul; thou must be brought before Cæsar: and, lo, God hath given thee all them that sail with thee. Wherefore, sirs, be of good cheer; for I believe God, that it shall be even as it was told me.” *SITI February 18, 1886, page 104.7*

Paul’s belief in the promise of God, however, did not keep him from putting forth every possible effort for the safety of himself and his fellow passengers. He exhorted them to eat, that they might retain their strength, and he hindered the sailors from leaving the ship, declaring that if they should leave, the rest could not be saved. The sailors were needed on board the ship, to do all that they could towards managing it. It is worthy of note, also, that because these people were saved in answer to his prayers, Paul did not set up in the life-saving business, and advertise that he would deliver from shipwreck all sailors who would take him along to pray for them. *SITI February 18, 1886, page 104.8*

The definition which we quoted is incorrect, because anesthesia, indifference to danger, leads one to make no effort for self-preservation; and faith which is unaccompanied by works is no faith at all, for “faith without works is dead.” That which is dead has no existence. *SITI February 18, 1886, page 104.9*

Sometimes that which is called faith is only blindness or negligence. For instance, there are many professors who, no doubt, pray for their children, and who therefore have, as they think, faith that they will be saved. Yet they do nothing more than pray occasionally for the children, and leave them practically without restraint. Now is it a manifestation of faith for the parents to believe that their children will be saved? Not at all; for the “evidence” is all against such a result. “A child left to himself bringeth his mother to shame,” says the Bible. Self-deception and careless security are altogether different from faith. *SITI February 18, 1886, page 104.10*

Thousands have no thought but that they will enter Heaven at last. Under certain circumstances it is proper to have faith that we shall be saved; but if the conditions are not met, there is no ground even for hope. What are the conditions? “If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments,” says the Saviour. Again: “Blessed are they that do his commandments, that they may have right to the tree of

life, and may enter in through the gates into the city.” *Revelation 22:14*. We may believe in Christ after a manner, that is, we may believe that he is the Son of God; but unless our belief leads to obedience, it is not true faith in Christ, because Christ suffered for us in order “that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us.” *SITI February 18, 1886, page 104.11*

“Yea, a man may say, Thou hast faith, and I have works; show me thy faith without thy works, and I will show thee my faith by my works.” *James 2:18*. E. J. W. *SITI February 18, 1886, page 104.12*

February 25, 1886

“Jurisdiction of the Law. Why the Law Was Spoken Only to the Jews (Concluded)” *The Signs of the Times*, 12, 8.

E. J. Waggoner

Now why was it that only the Jews had the written law? Did the giving of the law to them indicate partiality on the part of God? Not by any means: “For there is no respect of persons with God.” Before the exode, all the world was on a level, so far as written revelation was concerned. When sin separated man from God so that he could no longer talk with him face to face, then God supplemented the light which men had in their own hearts, by communicating with them in visions and dreams given to his prophets (*Numbers 12:6*), and by sending angels to them. *Genesis 22:15*. Had all men hearkened to the voice of conscience, the communication thus opened between God and man would have been sufficient to bring them at last to the state where the law would be perfectly restored in their hearts. This is that which God is still striving to accomplish. *Hebrews 8:10. SITI February 25, 1886, page 119.1*

But men did not care to follow even that portion of the law which they retained in their hearts, and consequently God could not send them more light through his prophets. Thus “as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a mind void of judgment.” *Romans 1:28*. In process of time, only one family retained the knowledge of God, and all the rest of the world were destroyed for their abominable wickedness. *SITI February 25, 1886, page 119.2*

Within four hundred years after the flood, men had again corrupted their way on the earth, and only Abraham remained loyal to God. He kept God’s commandments (*Genesis 26:5*), and had the determination to command his children and his household after him, that they should keep the way of the Lord, to do justice and judgment. *Genesis 18:19*. In order that the descendants of Abraham might retain the knowledge of God, God called Abraham away from his corrupt associates, and gave him the rite of

circumcision, in order that the separation might be complete. This rite was not designed to be a mark of birth or nationality, but simply as a means of keeping the observers of God's law from the contaminating influence of those who did not regard it; for whenever one of any other nation became willing to separate from his people and keep the law, he also became circumcised. *Genesis 17:12.SITI February 25, 1886, page 119.3*

This precaution served to keep the descendants of Abraham a distinct people through all their wanderings, and to preserve among them the knowledge of the true God. some from other tribes, getting the light from them, would occasionally turn to the Lord, to keep his commandments, and, becoming circumcised, would be counted as the descendants of righteous Abraham; but the great mass of the world chose to remain in the darkness of heathenism. Thus it happened that when the Lord brought his people from Egyptian bondage, they alone of all the people in the world had a knowledge of God. All the rest could say with Pharaoh, "I know not the Lord." At that time the Lord chose to give mankind his law in a manner so plain that it could not possibly be mistaken, and so that they could always meditate in it, in its perfection, even though no prophet were at hand. By this means, the Spirit could make greater progress, so to speak, in writing the law in their hearts. But to whom could he speak the law? Only to those who knew him, and would accept the law as coming from him. Therefore he was compelled to give the written law to the Jews, and make them light-bearers to the world. The law, when it entered, came to the Jews, not because it was designed for them alone, but because they alone would receive it.*SITI February 25, 1886, page 119.4*

As a further evidence that God was not moved by race considerations, and did not give the law exclusively to the Jews as a nation, we may notice the fact that when the Jews left Egypt, "a mixed multitude went up also with them." *Exodus 12:38; Numbers 11:4*. This "mixed multitude" was composed of Egyptians, and, no doubt, of people of other nationalities. These went along with the Jews, and with them received the law from God at Mount Sinai.*SITI February 25, 1886, page 119.5*

We cannot close this portion of our subject without giving, from the

pen of another, the following graphic portrayal of the condition of a people who should have no regard for the law of God:-*SITI February 25, 1886, page 119.6*

“No error accepted by the Christian world strikes more boldly against the authority of Heaven, none is more directly opposed to the dictates of reason, none is more pernicious in its results, than the modern doctrine, so rapidly gaining ground, that God’s law is no longer binding upon men. Every nation has its laws, which command respect and obedience; no government could exist without them; and can it be conceived that the Creator of the heavens and the earth has no law to govern the beings He has made? Suppose that prominent ministers were publicly to teach that the statutes which govern their land and protect the rights of its citizens were not obligatory—that they restricted the liberties of the people, and therefore ought not to be obeyed; how long would such men be tolerated in the pulpit? But is it a graver offense to disregard the laws of states and nations than to trample upon those divine precepts which are the foundation of all government? It would be far more consistent for nations to abolish their statutes, and permit the people to do as they please, than for the Ruler of the universe to annul His law, and leave the world without a standard to condemn the guilty or justify the obedient. Would we know the result of making void the law of God? The experiment has been tried. Terrible were the scenes enacted in France when atheism became the controlling power. It was then demonstrated to the world that to throw off the restraints which God has imposed is to accept the rule of the cruelest of tyrants. When the standard of righteousness is set aside, the way is open for the prince of evil to establish his power in the earth.*SITI February 25, 1886, page 119.7*

“Wherever the divine precepts are rejected, sin ceases to appear sinful or righteousness desirable. Those who refuse to submit to the government of God are wholly unfitted to govern themselves. Through their pernicious teachings the spirit of insubordination is implanted in the hearts of children and youth, who are naturally impatient of control; and a lawless, licentious state of society results. While scoffing at the credulity of those who obey the requirements of God, the multitudes eagerly accept the delusions of Satan. They give the rein to lust and practice the sins which have

called down judgments upon the heathen.*SITI February 25, 1886, page 119.8*

“Let the restraint imposed by the divine law be wholly removed, and human laws would soon be disregarded. Because God forbids dishonest practices,-coveting, lying, and defrauding,-men are ready to trample upon His statutes as a hindrance to their worldly prosperity; but the results of banishing these precepts would be such as they do not anticipate. If the law were not binding, why should any fear to transgress? Property would no longer be safe. Men would obtain their neighbors’ possessions by violence, and the strongest would become richest. Life itself would not be respected. Those who disregard the commandments of God sow disobedience to reap disobedience. The marriage vow would no longer stand as a sacred bulwark to protect the family. He who had the power, would, if he desired, take his neighbor’s wife by violence. The fifth commandment would be set aside with the fourth. Children would not shrink from taking the life of their parents, if by so doing they could obtain the desire of their corrupt hearts. The civilized world would become a horde of robbers and assassins; and peace, rest and happiness would be banished from the earth.”-*Mrs. E. G. White, in “Great Controversy,” vol. 4, chap. 51.SITI February 25, 1886, page 119.9*

This is just the state of things that would exist, not only in this world, but in all the universe, if the ten commandments were not the universal rule of action. If there be any portion of the universe where the decalogue is not the recognized law, the above paragraphs accurately describe the condition of its society. E. J. W.*SITI February 25, 1886, page 119.10*

“The Chinese Question” The Signs of the Times, 12, 8.

E. J. Waggoner

It is well known by all the readers of the SIGNS OF THE TIMES that this paper is purely a religious family journal. On political questions we have ever been strictly non-partisan, not because we have not private opinions on political matters, but because there are thousands of papers in which people can find the news of the day,

and because we believe that we have a work to do that is of far greater importance. The matter of high or low tariff is of trifling importance compared with the things which pertain to our eternal destiny.*SITI February 25, 1886, page 119.11*

But the anti-Chinese agitation has assumed such proportions on this coast, that we feel it duty to define our position upon it; and this because it is becoming a question of morals fully as much as one of politics.*SITI February 25, 1886, page 119.12*

In the first place, we will say that there are features of the Chinese question which people in the East, where Chinamen are very scarce, cannot possibly appreciate. One who passes through "Chinatown" in San Francisco will learn more of Chinese character and habits in a single hour than he could by reading books for a month. They are not the most desirable neighbors, by any means. They are of a race that is so entirely different from ours that it is probably impossible that there should be any assimilation between the two, even in a civil capacity. And we do not think that it would be wise to attempt to make American citizens of them. While we believe that God made of one blood all the nations of men, to dwell on all the face of the earth, we also believe that he has "determined the bounds of their habitation." For this reason we think that unlimited Chinese immigration would be an injury to this country, and possibly to the Chinese themselves.*SITI February 25, 1886, page 119.13*

But some of the Chinese are here, and it should be remembered that they came by invitation. They came for the purpose of bettering their condition; and it must also be remembered that if they have bettered their own condition, they have added immensely to the resources of this country. Hundreds of miles of railroad have been built by them, over places where few but Chinamen would be willing to work; and thousands of acres of land on this coast have been cleared by the Chinese, and are now teeming with the fruits of the earth as a result of their labor.*SITI February 25, 1886, page 119.14*

Furthermore, the Chinese evil is not one-hundredth part as bad as it is represented to be. It is said that they degrade labor; but labor and mechanics receive higher wages in California than they do in the

East. It is said that they won't become Christianized. Perhaps they will not; we confess we don't see much inducement for them to; but there are many, many thousands of the Caucasian race who show, not indifference to Christianity, as to the Chinese, but open contempt. It is said that they are vicious; but a drunken Chinaman would be a novelty; and the number of brothels and gambling dens that are run by Chinamen can be quadrupled in San Francisco by the same class of places in which no Chinaman ever set his foot. Therefore we say that the cry that "the heathen Chinese" is corrupting the youth of our land is a point poorly taken.*SITI February 25, 1886, page 119.15*

The question now is, What shall be done with those that are here? The answer comes back, "The Chinese must go!" There is no doubt but that the country could get along without them; so far as we are concerned, it would make no difference; for we do not employ them. But we will say frankly that we have no sympathy with a method that is to be adopted to drive them out. It is proposed to boycott, not only the Chinese, but every man who refuses to boycott them, and also to boycott those who do not boycott those who do not boycott the Chinese.*SITI February 25, 1886, page 119.16*

We cannot think that all who have committed themselves to such a course have fully considered what they are doing. For ourselves, we believe it is condemned by every principle of right. We are American citizens, and we have always had unbounded respect for those brave men who, at the risk of their lives, made the following declaration: "We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." That principle is just as true to-day as it was a hundred and ten years ago; and it is just as applicable to the Chinese as it is to the Americans or Europeans. And that statement of the Declaration of Independence derives its truth from the Golden Rule spoken by our Saviour. We must not infringe upon anybody's rights, but must allow them the same freedom that we would exact for ourselves. Those who are unwilling to grant liberty to others, are not worthy of it themselves.*SITI February 25, 1886, page 119.17*

It is true the Chinese are heathen, and they have some terribly

debasement vices. But the fact that the American and European even in this country outnumber the Chinese ten to one; that for every Chinese gambler, there are doubtless a score of white gamblers; and that among the white population whisky has doubtless a hundred victims where opium has one among the Chinese; is ample evidence that it is not on moral grounds that Chinese expulsion is called for. The Chinese smoke opium in their dens, and stay there till they recover from its effects; but the whites drink whiskey everywhere, and the effects never cease. We are finally convinced that if the Chinese were patrons of the saloons, the outcry against them would be very much more feeble than it now is. *SITI February 25, 1886, page 120.1*

But suppose that the Chinaman is not covered by the Declaration of Independence, it cannot be denied that all native-born Americans have equal rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Then to boycott our fellow-citizens is contrary both to the genius of our Government and the law of God. For example, here is my neighbor; he is a good, law-abiding citizen; possibly he is a brother in the church. He does not see fit to resort to mob violence to rid the country of the Chinese, and so I am required to pledge myself to boycott him, to have no dealings with him, to keep others from dealing with him, and to injure his business all I can. Is this right? Every honest person must say No. then I will not do it; for though I may not be what many are pleased to call a sentimentalist, I profess to be a Christian. *SITI February 25, 1886, page 120.2*

Whenever evil is done that good may come, the devil gains a victory, and the good never comes. It is as true now as it was three thousand years ago, that the violent dealing of any man is sure to come back upon his own pate. Even though the Chinese were more of a curse than it is claimed that they are, this boycotting business would be a thing to be unqualifiedly condemned. It is a cowardly act, and will fail of the desired result. It is the design of the anti-Chinese League to secure uniformity of action against the Chinese, so that they can say to Congress that the people of California are a unit upon this matter. But do they not see that when their petition goes to Congress the very fact that boycotting has been resorted to will kill it? The men at Washington are wise enough to perceive that there is not unity of sentiment when it is necessary to ruin people's

business in order to “convert” them to any course of action.*SITI February 25, 1886, page 120.3*

The best men of the Pacific Coast, the Christian men, the men of steady habits and stability of character, are not in favor of boycotting, which is simply mob rule. While there is a general sentiment against further Chinese immigration, the men just referred to are in favor of letting the matter be settled in a peaceable manner by the legislature. Many have been led against their better judgment to engage in this boycotting for fear of the results to their business. But we believe that “the spirit of ’76,” to say nothing of the spirit of Christianity, will lead a man to do what is right, and to be just to all men, regardless of the consequences to himself. And the color of a man, the shape of his eyes, the length of his hair, his private opinions, or his personal tastes and habits, have nothing to do with determine whether or not he is to be treated justly.*SITI February 25, 1886, page 120.4*

We have written thus at length because we know that many conscientious persons are troubled as to their duty in this crisis, and we desire to help them to a decision that will not put them to shame in the day of Judgment. E. J. W.*SITI February 25, 1886, page 120.5*

March 4, 1886

“Throwing the Bible Aside” *The Signs of the Times*, 12, 9.

E. J. Waggoner

A little over a year ago (Jan. 8, 1885) the *Christian at Work* used the following language:-*SITI March 4, 1886, page 134.1*

“The selection of Sunday, thus changing the particular day designated in the fourth commandment, was brought about by the gradual concurrence of the early Christian church, and on this basis, and none other, does the Christian Sabbath, the first day of the week, rightly rest.”*SITI March 4, 1886, page 134.2*

This is not very definite; for the “early Christian church” covers quite a space of time, including the time of Christ and the apostles; and people might be led to think that the *Christian at Work* claimed apostolic authority for Sunday observance. But that is not the case, as the following from the same paper, Feb. 18, 1886, shows:-*SITI March 4, 1886, page 134.3*

“We hear less than we used to about the apostolic origin of the present Sunday observance, and for the reason that while the Sabbath and Sabbath rest are woven into the warp and woof of Scripture, it is now seen, as it is admitted, that we must go to later than apostolic time for the establishment of Sunday observance.”*SITI March 4, 1886, page 134.4*

Very true; and we knew it before the *Christian at Work* said it; for we have read the Bible. But here is a point for consideration. “The Sabbath and Sabbath rest are woven into the warp and woof of Scripture,” we are told. Now what day is it that is thus identified in the Scriptures as the Sabbath? It is the seventh day, and no other. This the *Christian at Work* admits when it says that “the church” has taken the liberty of discarding the day designated in the fourth commandment, and that this was done this side the time of the apostles. We would ask, then, how it is possible to reconcile Sunday observance with reverence for the Bible. If a man takes the Bible, and that alone, as his guide, he must keep the seventh day of

the week; and (according to the above quotations with which we agree), if he accept Sunday he must go directly against the Bible. It ought not to take any candid person long to decide what to do in this matter, for it is evident that "their rock is not as our rock, even our enemies themselves being judges." And, besides, one who was foremost among the apostles has said: "But though we, or an angel from Heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed." E. J. W. *SITI March 4, 1886, page 134.5*

"Perpetuity of the Law" The Signs of the Times, 12, 9.

E. J. Waggoner

It is impossible to discuss one branch of this great subject of the law without touching more or less upon every other branch. So in considering the nature of the law and its relation to the gospel, we have necessarily shown that it must endure forever. We shall not take up this branch more in detail. *SITI March 4, 1886, page 134.6*

The law of God is the righteousness of God. It may not be amiss to review the proof on this point. David, in these words, bears witness to the fact that the commandments are themselves righteousness: "My tongue shall speak of thy word; for all thy commandments are righteousness." *Psalms 119:172*. Since there is no righteousness but that of God, the commandments must be his righteousness; but we have still more direct evidence. The prophet Isaiah thus contrasts the things of earth with the righteousness of God: "Lift up your eyes to the heavens, and look upon the earth beneath; for the heavens shall vanish away like smoke, and the earth shall wax old like a garment, and they that dwell therein shall die in like manner; but my salvation shall be forever; and my righteousness shall not be abolished." *Isaiah 51:6*. In the next verse he proceeds to tell what this righteousness is: "Hearken unto me, ye that know righteousness, the people in whose heart is my law." Because the law is the righteousness of God, it enables those who are instructed in it to "give judgment upon good or evil." *SITI March 4, 1886, page 134.7*

The text says, "My righteousness shall not be abolished." Since

there can be no question but that “righteousness” is here used with reference to the law of God, we may properly substitute “law” for “righteousness,” thus: “The earth shall wax old like a garment, and they that dwell therein shall die in like manner; but my salvation shall be forever, and my law shall not be abolished.” This gives the exact meaning, and is no more positive than we shall find stated elsewhere. *SITI March 4, 1886, page 134.8*

God is from everlasting to everlasting. *Psalm 90:2*. As he cannot exist separate from his nature, or, in other words, separate from himself, and the law is the transcript of his nature, it necessarily follows that the law exists from everlasting to everlasting. And since created beings, who are all subjects of God’s Government, cannot obey an abstract principle, but must have that principle clearly defined, we know that at least from the time that God created intelligent beings as subjects of his Government, the law must have existed in written form or must have been expressed in definite language. And from the beginning of his creation to everlasting ages, it must continue so to exist. *SITI March 4, 1886, page 134.9*

This is exactly what we are taught by the words of Christ in the sermon on the mount. Said he: “Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets; I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill (to ratify, establish, or teach). For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.” *Matthew 5:17, 18*. Here two things are mentioned, the law and the prophets. Christ did not come to destroy either one. He came in fulfillment of prophecy, and also to teach the law, which he did in the sermon on the mount. He did not, however, fulfill all the prophecy; for some of it reaches far beyond his first advent. For instance in *Psalm 89:20-29* we read the following prophecy concerning the kingdom of David, over which Christ, as the Son of David:-*SITI March 4, 1886, page 135.1*

“I have found David my servant; with my holy oil have I anointed him; with whom my hand shall be established; mine arm also shall strengthen him. The enemy shall not exact upon him; nor the son of wickedness afflict him. And I will beat down his foes before his face, and plague them that hate him. But my faithfulness and my mercy shall be with him; and in my name shall his horn be exalted. I will

set his hand also in the sea, and his right hand in the rivers. He shall cry unto me, Thou art my father, my God, and the rock of my salvation. Also I will make him my firstborn, higher than the kings of the earth. My mercy will I keep for him for evermore, and my covenant shall stand fast with him. His seed also will I make to endure for ever, and *his throne as the days of heaven.*" *SITI March 4, 1886, page 135.2*

In *verses 35-37* we read further:-*SITI March 4, 1886, page 135.3*

"Once have I sworn by my holiness that I will not lie unto David. His seed shall endure for ever, and his throne as the sun before me. It shall be established for ever as the moon, and as a faithful witness in heaven." *SITI March 4, 1886, page 135.4*

Here is a prophecy that will be in process of fulfillment as long as the sun and moon endure, even to all the days of Heaven. Now the words of Christ are, that "one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled." Till all what be fulfilled? Evidently till all the prophets be fulfilled, for he is speaking of the prophets, in connection with the law. Then, in view of the prophecy that we just read, we know that not the slightest change can be made in the law so long as Christ reigns on the throne of David; and that will be throughout eternity. *SITI March 4, 1886, page 135.5*

Nothing can add to the force of this testimony. We may quote other texts, as, "It is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail" (*Luke 16:17*), or, "The works of his hands are verity and judgment; all his commandments are sure. They stand fast forever and ever, and are done in truth and uprightness" (*Psalms 111:7, 8*), but, strong as they are, they do not go beyond what has already been presented. To give all the texts which show the enduring nature of the law, would be to quote a large portion of the Bible. In our consideration of other points connected with this subject, many additional proofs will necessarily be brought in. But right here we wish to introduce a few quotations from eminent authors of different denominations, to show that they have used just as strong language as we have to set forth the holiness and perpetuity of the law. Bishop E. O. Haven said:-*SITI March 4, 1886, page 135.6*

“Not only is every one of the ten commandments binding upon all men, [but] every one is often broken by persons who have received Christian instruction. The decalogue is God’s grand compendium of moral philosophy. Whoever obeys it in letter and spirit is a perfect man.”-“*Pillars of Truth*,” p. 7.*SITI March 4, 1886, page 135.7*

Again the same author says:-*SITI March 4, 1886, page 135.8*

“This decalogue can never become obsolete. It was designed for all men, and, obeyed, would render all men noble, and worthy of immortal blessedness. It is a kind of concentration of the moral teachings of the Bible.”-“*Pillars of truth*,” p. 235.*SITI March 4, 1886, page 135.9*

The “Speaker’s Commentary,” on *Matthew 12:8* says:-*SITI March 4, 1886, page 135.10*

“On what principle of legislation can it be maintained that, because laws are imposed by the ruler for the benefit of the subject, therefore they may be dispensed with at his own convenience? This is utterly untenable as regards the laws of man, still more so as regards the laws of God.”*SITI March 4, 1886, page 135.11*

Rev. S. P. Sprecher, pastor of Calvary Presbyterian Church San Francisco, in a sermon delivered Feb. 18, 1883, and reported in the *Occident* of Feb. 21, 1883, said:-*SITI March 4, 1886, page 135.12*

“When God gave the ten commandments on Sinai, he did not propose that men should obey them if they commended themselves to the natural heart; but that they should obey because they were the voice of God. Truth is not always seen and appreciated at first. It generally requires a certain favorable state of the heart.”*SITI March 4, 1886, page 135.13*

On the words of our Lord in *Matthew 5:17*, “I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill,” we find the following comment by Wesley, in the first volume of his works, sermon 25:-*SITI March 4, 1886, page 135.14*

“Some have conceived our Lord to mean: I am come to fulfill this by my entire and perfect obedience to it. And it cannot be doubted but

he did, in this sense, fulfill every part of it. But this does not appear to be what he intends here, being foreign to the scope of his present discourse. Without question, his meaning in that place is (consistently with all that goes before and follows after), I am come to establish it in its fullness, in spite of all the glosses of men; I am come to declare the true and full import of every part of it; to show the length and breadth, the entire extent, of every commandment contained therein, and the height and depth, the inconceivable purity and spirituality of it in all its branches.”*SITI March 4, 1886, page 135.15*

Rev. W. A. Jarrel (Baptist), in “Old Testament Ethics Vindicated,” pp. 25-27, speaks as follows concerning the law of God:-*SITI March 4, 1886, page 135.16*

“The divine will must be what the divine nature is. That the will must be what the nature is, is one of the fundamental truths of all true moral philosophy.... While the law is not the nature of God, it is the effect and likeness of that nature; it is the perfect reflection of his infinite holiness and wisdom. It must, therefore, be as unchangeable as the infinite holiness of the divine nature. Law is the positive enactment of this nature; it is the expression of God’s will.”*SITI March 4, 1886, page 135.17*

“Law, then, being the expression of the holiness of the immutable, divine nature, it can never be relaxed or changed. As God’s nature must forever will only moral right, his law can never be other than the expression of moral right.”*SITI March 4, 1886, page 135.18*

This will suffice for quotations from religious authors. These quotations show that the idea here presented are no new thing, so that no one need fear to accept them, lest he should be straying from the old paths. They help to confirm the argument that the ten commandments are the “old paths,” into which God calls all men to turn their steps. They are the way of holiness, the eternal way of peace; and human tongue or human pen can never adequately express their purity and their unchanging nature. E. J. W.*SITI March 4, 1886, page 135.19*

“Something about Writing” The Signs of the Times, 12, 9.

E. J. Waggoner

This is an age when people read; and when everybody reads, somebody must of necessity write. Moreover, if those who read are benefited by their reading, it must be because those who write have written something worth reading, and have written so plainly that the meaning cannot be misunderstood. Now, since reading from which no benefit is gained is a waste of time, it follows that a great responsibility rests upon all who write. We therefore give a few practical hints for the benefit of those who feel it to be their duty to write, but do not know just how to do so to the best advantage.*SITI March 4, 1886, page 135.20*

The first thing necessary, if one would write, is to have something to say. Not only should you have something which you think is worth telling, but you must be fully persuaded that it is very necessary that others should know it. You may be mistaken in your convictions, but that is another matter; the point is, if you wish others to be impressed by what you write, you must yourself first be impressed by it.*SITI March 4, 1886, page 135.21*

Have your subject well in hand before you begin to write. Do not take your pen, dip it in the ink, and then wait for the ideas to come and arrange themselves in the proper order. Thoughts are not so obedient as to do that. They will not arrange themselves; you must do it. Before you begin to write, take a pencil and paper, and jot down the various points which you wish to make, the texts which you wish to use, etc. Then arrange them, and your work is half done. As you write, you can alter your plan, adding or omitting thoughts as seems best.*SITI March 4, 1886, page 135.22*

Express yourself in the simplest and most direct manner possible. The object of language is to convey thought; therefore the more plainly this thought is expressed, the better is the language. Most younger writers do not seem to understand this, and some writers never learn it. Aim to write so plainly that people not only *may* understand, but that they *must* understand.*SITI March 4, 1886, page 135.23*

Do not try to be grand, or to soar. In short, do not try to force yourself to write in some particular style. If you do, your lameness

will be apparent. There are writers whose eloquent passages and well-rounded periods are a constant delight. You may write as they do, if it is natural for you to do so. But do not sacrifice strength for beauty. A thing may be very pretty, and yet be utterly useless. *SITI March 4, 1886, page 135.24*

Of course this means you must not imitate any one style of expression. Be yourself. There is no more reason why you should imitate another's style of writing than there is that you should imitate his manner of conversation. Saul's armor was no doubt first class in every respect, but David could not fight in it. Because your neighbor's coat fits him well, you must not conclude that it will also become you. Your coat may be of an entirely different size and pattern, and yet it may fit you as well as it fits him. So words which are very impressive when uttered by one, may be commonplace when spoken by another. It is just as necessary that the style of expression should fit the individual as it is that his coat should fit him. *SITI March 4, 1886, page 135.25*

Above all, don't plagiarize. This is a word which has much the same meaning as embezzlement, defalcation, etc. In plain English, it means stealing. And don't steal. If somebody has written something which you think is good, don't try to get the credit of it by signing your name to it. If you quote it, give the author the credit. If you do not know the author's name, or do not wish to give it, at least indicate that the quoted passage is not your own. This is the honest way. To do any other way is to be dishonest. The law does not punish a man for appropriating an article that has been written by another, unless the article has been copyrighted; but such an act is no less desirable on that account. "Thou shalt not steal." *SITI March 4, 1886, page 135.26*

Besides the sin of plagiarism, there is another thing about it to be considered, and that is the loss of reputation which it brings. A man steals money because he has none, and does not like to work. It is very natural to imagine that people steal ideas for the same reason. If your ideas are your own, and are expressed in your own style, they may be somewhat crude, but you will get credit for just what you are. But if you take the ideas and expressions of another and pass them off as her own, people will not give you credit for being

able to produce anything yourself.*SITI March 4, 1886, page 136.1*

Of course it is understood that there is very little absolute originality. We are all mutually dependent. We know nothing that we have not learned; and we have learned somebody new before we did. But we may have combinations of ideas that no one else has, and we may be able to express ideas in a way that has occurred to no one else. This is originality, in the common acceptance of the term. If one has not this originality, if he cannot say anything that has not already been said, there is no occasion for him to write.*SITI March 4, 1886, page 136.2*

Don't attempt to write poetry if you can possibly keep from it. This rule should be written in capital letters, and kept constantly before every young writer. Hundreds of persons who might have been useful, have resigned themselves by starting in with poetry. Many people seem to think that poetry is the simplest and most natural kind of composition. This is a grave error. Composition is not necessarily poetry because each line begins with a capital letter; neither can all rhyme be called poetry. There are not so many poets in the world by a great many thousand as is sometimes supposed. Don't imagine that you are one of the few, just because you enjoy reading poetry. But if your thoughts will present themselves in rhyme and meter, and you cannot possibly express herself except in verse, then go ahead. The result may be poetry, and it may not be; but it is more likely to be poetry than is a great part of the matter which is called by that name.*SITI March 4, 1886, page 136.3*

Finally, if you wish your manuscript to receive speedy attention from any editor, observe the following simple items:-*SITI March 4, 1886, page 136.4*

Write on ruled paper.*SITI March 4, 1886, page 136.5*

Write only on one side of the sheet.*SITI March 4, 1886, page 136.6*

Use pen and ink.*SITI March 4, 1886, page 136.7*

Write as legibly as you possibly can. Don't "dash off" your thoughts, and then ask the editor to excuse poor writing, as you were in a hurry. The chances are that if you were in too great a hurry to write

legibly, the editor will be in too great a hurry to attempt to read what you have written. Many valuable thoughts have perished in the wastebasket because of a failure to observe this last rule. Remember that to write poorly is solely the editor's prerogative.*SITI March 4, 1886, page 136.8*

These are by no means all the important points that might be noted; yet if only these are kept in mind, and you write, not for fame, nor for any selfish motive, but with the simple purpose to do good, you will be quite likely to write something worth reading. E. J. W.*SITI March 4, 1886, page 136.9*

March 11, 1886

“A Question Concerning the Sanctuary” The Signs of the Times, 12, 10.

E. J. Waggoner

A brother sends a letter of inquiries, in which we find the following:-*SITI March 11, 1886, page 151.1*

“In reference to the priests taking the blood of the victim into the sanctuary, it seems to me that in case it was for the sin of a priest or of the whole congregation, then the blood was taken into the first room [the holy place]; but if it was for a ruler or one of the common people, the work was all done in the court, by the altar of burnt offering. And if this is true, how were the sins of *these* lodged in the sanctuary? From *Leviticus 10:17*, I gather that the priests, by eating of this sin offerings whose blood was not taken into the sanctuary, *bore the iniquity* of the people.”*SITI March 11, 1886, page 151.2*

The brother is partly right and partly wrong in his conclusions. It is true that the blood of some sin offerings was taken into the holy place, and that the blood of others was not. When the blood was taken into the sanctuary, the body of the victim was burnt without the camp. See *Leviticus 4:1-26; 6:30*. But when the blood of the offering was not taken into the sanctuary, its flesh was taken by the priests into the holy place, and was there eaten by them. See *Leviticus 6:24, 25*. Thus the sin was figuratively taken within the sanctuary,-in one case by the blood, and in the other by the flesh.*SITI March 11, 1886, page 151.3*

The wrong part of the conclusion was in supposing that in the latter case the priests themselves bore the iniquity of the people. *Leviticus 10:16-18* reads as follows:-*SITI March 11, 1886, page 151.4*

“And Moses diligently sought the goat of the sin offering, and, behold, it was burnt; and he was angry with Eleazar and Ithamar, the sons of Aaron which were left alive, saying, Wherefore have ye not eaten the sin offering in the holy place, seeing it is most holy, and God hath given it you to bear the iniquity of the congregation, to

make atonement for them before the Lord? Behold, the blood of it was not brought in within the holy place; ye should indeed have eaten it in the holy place, as I commanded.”*SITI March 11, 1886, page 151.5*

A careful reading of the above, especially *verse 17*, plainly shows that *the flesh* of the sin offering, and *not* the priests, was to bear the iniquity of the congregation. What did Moses say God had given to the priests? The flesh. For what purpose had he given it? To bear the iniquity of the congregation. The construction of the sentence absolutely forbids the conclusion that the priests bore the iniquity.*SITI March 11, 1886, page 151.6*

The victim represent Christ. He “bare our sins in his own body on the tree.” *1 Peter 2:24*. “The Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all.” *Isaiah 53:6*. In his own person he took them into the true sanctuary in Heaven. And as the lamb or goat typified Christ, the sins that were confessed over it were laid upon it as a whole, so that they might be conveyed into the sanctuary either by the flesh or by the blood. The animal was innocent, and might therefore be a type of Christ; but the priest was a sinful, mortal man, and could not therefore himself represent Christ in the act of bearing our sins. We design ere long to give this subject a more extended consideration in the SIGNS. E. J. W.*SITI March 11, 1886, page 151.7*

“The Foundation of God’s Government” The Signs of the Times, 12, 10.

E. J. Waggoner

There is one more argument that we would introduce right here. To do so, we shall have to refer to the tabernacle built by Moses, and we shall try to do so as briefly as is consistent with perfect clearness. In general, only references will be given; the reader can look them up at his leisure.*SITI March 11, 1886, page 151.8*

In *Exodus 25:8* we read these words: “And let them make me a sanctuary, that I may dwell among them.” These words of the Lord follow a command to Moses to receive offerings of gold, silver, brass, acacia wood, fine linen, goat’s hair, etc. Of these the tabernacle was to be built. Chapters 25-30 contain the complete

description of this structure, together with all the furniture and vessels connected with it. The framework was composed of boards standing upright. There were twenty on each side, and eight on the west end. These boards were ten cubits fifteen feet long, and a cubit and a half wide, and were entirely covered with gold; each one had at the lower extremity two tenons, which were inserted into the sockets of silver, and this arrangement, together with bars that ran through rings on the sides of the boards, served to keep them in position. *Exodus 26:15-30. SITI March 11, 1886, page 151.9*

The east end was closed by a vail, or hanging, of fine linen of various colors, with figures of cherubim worked on it. This was called the door of the tabernacle. *Exodus 26:36, 37*. Four curtains, made respectively of linen, goat's hair, rams' skins, and badgers' skins, formed the covering of the tabernacle. *Exodus 26:1-14*. Besides the door, there was a second vail of the same material, which divided the tabernacle into two rooms; the first was called the "holy place," and the second the "most holy place." *Exodus 26:31-33; Hebrews 9:1-3*. So much for the tabernacle itself. *SITI March 11, 1886, page 151.10*

Within this tabernacle were various articles of furniture. Just within the holy place on the north side, was a table, upon which show-bread was placed. *Exodus 26:23-35; 40:22, 23*. On the south side there was a candlestick, or lamp-stand, having seven lamps, the whole beaten out of one solid piece of gold. These lamps were to be kept continually burning. *Exodus 25:31, 39*. In the western extremity of the holy place, just before the second vail, was the golden altar of incense. Upon this the priest offered incense night and morning. *Exodus 30:1-9*. This is all that was in the holy place. In the most holy place there was but one article of furniture, the ark of the testimony (*Exodus 25:10-22*), and that is of so much importance in our investigation that we shall examine it more particularly. *SITI March 11, 1886, page 151.11*

By a careful examination of the scripture last referred to, we find that this ark was an oblong box of acacia wood, covered within and without with gold. On its sides were rings of gold, through which staves were passed for use in carrying it, so that it need never be touched by human hands. The cover to this ark was called the

mercy-seat, and was of solid gold. Upon the mercy-seat were the cherubim, one on each end, of solid gold, and of the same piece as the mercy-seat itself. The wings of these cherubim were extended so as to form an arch over the ark, and their faces looked toward each other, and downward to the ark. Within the ark was the "testimony" (*Exodus 25:16*), which was nothing other than the ten commandments which God spoke from Sinai, wrote on tables of stone, and delivered to Moses for safe deposit in the ark. *Deuteronomy 10:1-5*. This ark, as stated before, was in the most holy place (*Hebrews 9:3-5*), into which no man could enter save the high priest, and he only once a year. *Hebrews 9:7*. Even then he did not see the ark, because the cloud of incense arising from the censer which he held in his hand, entirely concealed it. *Leviticus 16:12, 13*. Without this precaution, he would have died, and the reason why will presently appear. *SITI March 11, 1886, page 151.12*

Turning to *Exodus 25:20-22*, we read: "And the cherubims shall stretch forth their wings on high, covering the mercy seat with their wings, and their faces shall look one to another; toward the mercy seat shall the faces of the cherubims be. And thou shalt put the mercy seat above upon the ark; and in the ark thou shalt put the testimony that I shall give thee. And there I will meet with thee, and I will commune with thee from above the mercy seat, from between the two cherubims which are upon the ark of the testimony, of all things which I will give thee in commandment unto the children of Israel." Now we know why no one except the high priest could enter the most holy place, and why even he, in his yearly visit, could not behold the mercy-seat and live. It was because the glory of God was there. In that place the priest was in the immediate presence of God. *SITI March 11, 1886, page 151.13*

It is now time to inquire how Moses, after having been commanded to build the sanctuary, happened to light upon the special style that he did. For an answer, read *Exodus 25:9, 40*. "According to all that I show thee, after the pattern of the tabernacle, and the pattern of all the instruments thereof, even so shall ye make it." "And look that thou make them after their pattern, which was showed thee in the mount." Since it was to be God's house, God himself furnished the plan. But by reading a little more, we shall find that this pattern was not something then for the first time conceived. In the 9th of

Hebrews, Paul, after telling that Moses purified (in a figure) the tabernacle, and all the vessels of the ministry, by sprinkling them with the blood of animals, says, *verse 23*: “It was therefore necessary that *the patterns of things in the Heavens* should be purified with these; but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these.” This tells us plainly that the tabernacle and its furniture were copied after things in the Heavens. Now read *Hebrews 8:1, 2*: “Now of the things which we have spoken, this is the sum: we have such an high priest, who is set on the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in the Heavens; a minister of *the* sanctuary, and of *the true tabernacle*, which the Lord pitched, and not man.” *SITI March 11, 1886, page 151.14*

Now we know that the tabernacle built by Moses as a dwelling-place for God, was only a temporary representation of God’s real, permanent dwelling-place in Heaven. That God does have a tangible structure in Heaven for his occupancy, where, to use a common expression, he holds court, is evident from the scriptures just quoted, and also from *Psalms 11:4*: “The Lord is in his holy temple, the Lord’s throne is in Heaven; his eyes behold, his eyelids try, the children of men.” This temple, the place of God’s throne, has been seen in Heaven. John says: “And the temple of God was opened in Heaven, and there was seen in his temple the ark of his testament.” *Revelation 11:19. SITI March 11, 1886, page 151.15*

If we should ask what portion of the earthly tabernacle especially represented God’s throne, the reader would almost at once answer: “The ark, with the cherubim on the mercy-seat above; because it was between these cherubim that his glory was manifested.” This would be correct. God’s actual dwelling-place is between the cherubim; when he moves from place to place, his throne (a living throne) and the cherubim accompany him. For proof of this read the following texts:—*SITI March 11, 1886, page 151.16*

“Give ear, O Shepherd of Israel, thou that leadest Joseph like a flock; thou that dwellest between the cherubim, shine forth.” *Psalms 80:1. SITI March 11, 1886, page 151.17*

“The Lord reigneth; let the people tremble; he sitteth between the cherubim; let the earth be moved.” *Psalms 90:1*. Besides these, read

Ezekiel 1 and 10; Isaiah 6:1-3, and Ezekiel 28:14. SITI March 11, 1886, page 152.1

Remember now that everything in the earthly sanctuary was a representation of some corresponding thing in the heavenly sanctuary, as nearly exact as human hands could approach to a likeness of things not made with hands, and we shall of necessity conclude that the throne of God in Heaven is directly above the original law of ten commandments, of which the tables placed in the ark by Moses were only a copy. In other words, the ten commandments form the foundation of God's throne. *SITI March 11, 1886, page 152.2*

In further pursuit of this thought, read *Psalms 80:14*: "Justice and judgment are the habitation of thy throne; mercy and truth shall go before thy face." Also the following: "The Lord reigneth; let the earth rejoice; let the multitude of isles be glad thereof. Clouds and darkness are round about him; righteousness and judgment are the habitation [establishment] of his throne." *Psalms 97:1, 2*. We have already learned that the law is holy, just, and good, and that it is righteousness; it is perfect righteousness, and there is no righteousness outside of this law of ten commandments. Therefore when the psalmist says that righteousness is the establishment of God's throne, it is equivalent to saying that God's throne is established upon the ten commandments; that the ten commandments literally form the basis, or foundation, of the throne of God. *SITI March 11, 1886, page 152.3*

This term "throne" is often applied to sovereign authority or royal dignity. The ruler of a country is the representative of that government, and by metonymy the place where the ruler dispenses justice is put for the ruler, and so for the government. We speak of "the throne of the universe," meaning thereby the government of the universe. So, then, the fact that the ten commandments are the foundation of God's throne, shows that they are the rule of his Government; that every act is in accordance with their just sanctions; and that all the creatures of his Government throughout the universe are required to obey them. *SITI March 11, 1886, page 152.4*

This is a conclusion which we are confident cannot be overthrown, nor can any one who holds himself to a strict regard for the plain word of God, contradict it. This being so, what a view it gives us of the perpetuity of God's law! Leaving the eternity that is past, we look forward and ask, How long shall God's moral law endure? And the answer comes, It will endure just as long as God's throne endures, just as long as God rules the universe; for God's throne could not remain firm if its foundations were destroyed. *SITI March 11, 1886, page 152.5*

And this shows the unchanging nature of the law, as well as its perpetuity. The moral law is composed of ten precepts. Since the law is the foundation of God's throne, we may with propriety call the ten precepts the ten stones composing the foundation. Indeed, Bishop E. O. Haven, of the M. E. Church, seemed to have a similar idea in his mind, when he wrote the little book, entitled, "The Pillars of Truth." This work contains ten chapters, each chapter being the substance of a lecture before the students of Michigan University, the subject of the lectures being the ten commandments. These commandments, according to the bishop's idea, are the ten pillars that uphold all truth. This being true, how can one of them be exchanged for another? What would support the throne of the universe while the transfer was being made? Such a question needs no answer. When we realize the relation which the moral law sustains to God and his Government, the mind at once sees the absurdity of the idea that one jot or one tittle can pass from the law, or that the slightest change could ever be made in it. We must exclaim with the psalmist: "Thy word is true from the beginning; and every one of thy righteous judgments endureth forever." *Psalms 119:160. E. J. W. SITI March 11, 1886, page 152.6*

March 18, 1886

“Doers of the Law” *The Signs of the Times*, 12, 11.

E. J. Waggoner

In previous articles we have laid down some of the fundamental principles of the law. We have found that the moral law of ten commandments, spoken from Sinai, is perfect, holy, and good; that it is the instrument which enables us to judge between good and evil; that it is “the righteousness of God,” so that there is no goodness or morality to be found outside of it; that it is also called “the way,” “the way of peace,” “the truth,” “the testimony,” the “word of the Lord,” etc., and that it is the expression of God’s will; that the transgression of it is sin, which makes it necessary for the gospel to be preached, so that whoever admits the existence of sin, and the necessity for the preaching of the gospel, virtually testifies to the existence of the law; more than this, we have learned that, as the righteousness of God, it is the foundation of his throne, the basis of his government of the universe, and that it was therefore in full force before this world was brought into existence, and that it will continue in force as long as God’s throne endures, the delight of all the redeemed, throughout eternity. *SITI March 18, 1886, page 215.1*

These points must be borne in mind as we proceed to their application in the examination of special texts. In this examination the points mentioned above will be strengthened, if it is possible to strengthen a position already so strong. *SITI March 18, 1886, page 215.2*

We have already quoted *Romans 2:13*: “For not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified.” This statement of the apostle is unqualified, and admits of no qualification. The doers of the law shall be justified. The statement is positive and emphatic. There can be no qualification nor exception. Think a moment. It is the righteousness of God, the perfection of holiness. Must not the keeping of it, then, as Solomon says, be “the whole duty of man”? And if a man does his whole duty, and is a partaker of the righteousness of God, can he be condemned? Not by any means. God himself has declared, through

his inspired apostle, that “the doer of the law shall be justified.” Wherever in the universe a being is found who is a doer of the law, he is just in the sight of God.*SITI March 18, 1886, page 215.3*

Already I hear some one exclaim, “He thinks that man can save himself by his own works, and leaves no room for Christ.” Not so fast; do not pass judgment upon a piece of work until it is completed. Perhaps the proposition will seem clearer if we consider what constitutes one a “doer of the law.” Let us illustrate: A father goes from home, leaving his son a certain amount of work to perform. There is a portion of work for each hour,-enough to keep the son constantly employed. Suppose that the son works faithfully for an hour or two, and then consumes the remainder of the time in play; has he done what his father commanded? Certainly not. But suppose that he works faithfully every hour but one, and leaves the work allotted to that hour unperformed; can he now be called a doer of his father’s will? He evidently cannot. Unless he can truthfully say, “I have done what my father left for me to do,” he cannot be called a doer of his father’s will; and he cannot truthfully say that he has done what his father gave him to do, unless he has done all that was enjoined upon him.*SITI March 18, 1886, page 215.4*

This is more than a simple illustration; it is a plain statement of fact. The boy cannot be said to have done what his father told him to do, if he has not done it all; a man cannot be said to have traveled the road from one point to another, if he lacks a mile of it; even so no man can be called a “doer of the law” of God if he has ever violated one of its precepts. If there be a man who has kept every commandment but one, and has violated that one but a single time, he cannot be called a doer of the law, and hence cannot be justified by the law. He would be almost a doer of the law, but there is no promise of justification for those who simply almost do the law.*SITI March 18, 1886, page 215.5*

Right in this connection we must read the words of James: “For whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all. For he that said [or that law which said], Do not commit adultery, said also, Do not kill. Now if thou commit no adultery, yet if thou kill, thou art become a transgressor of the law.” *James 2:10, 11.SITI March 18, 1886, page 215.6*

Many people, in their shortsightedness, have thought that this is unjust. There is no injustice in it; it is simply a statement of what exists from the very nature of things. The apostle does not say that the man who breaks only one commandment shall be considered as guilty as he who should violate every one, although he is guilty of all. There are degrees of sin. The law is sometimes likened to a chain having ten links. Now if only one link be broken, the chain is broken, and, until that link is mended, is just as useless as though all the links were broken. So if a man breaks one commandment, he has broken the law, and it is just as impossible for the law to justify him as it would be if he had broken every precept. The following from Dr. Chalmers is direct on this point:-*SITI March 18, 1886, page 215.7*

“In order that you [may] feel the force of the apostle’s demonstration, there is one principle which is held to be sound in human law, and which, in all equity, ought to be extended to the law of God. The principle is this,-that however manifold the enactments of the law may be, it is possible, by one act or one kind of disobedience, to incur the guilt of an entire defiance to the authority which framed it; and therefore to bring rightfully down upon the head of the transgressor the whole weight of the severities which it denounces against the children of iniquity. To be worthy of death, it is not necessary to commit all the things which are included in the sad enumeration of human vices, any more than it is necessary for a criminal to add depredation to forgery, or murder to both, ere a capital sentence go out against him from the administrators of the law upon which he has trampled. You may as effectually cut with a friend by one hostile or insolent expression, as if you had employed a thousand; and your disavowal of authority may be as intelligibly announced by one deed of defiance as by many; and your contempt of Heaven’s court be as strongly manifested by your willful violation of one of the commandments, as if you had thwarted every requirement....*SITI March 18, 1886, page 215.8*

“The man who has thrown off the allegiance of religion, may neither have the occasion nor the wish to commit all the offenses which it prohibits, or to utter all the blasphemies which may be vented forth in the spirit of defiance against the Almighty’s throne. And yet the principle of defiance may have taken full possession of his heart,

and irreligion may be the element in which he breathes. And in every instance, when his will comes into competition with the will of God, may the creature lift himself above the Creator; and though, according to the varieties of natural temperament, these instances may be more manifold and various with one man than with another, yet that which essentially constitutes the character of moral and spiritual guilt may be of equal strength and inveteracy with both.... Ungodliness, in short, is not a thing of tale and measure; it is a thing of weight and of quality.”- *Chalmers on the Romans, Lecture VI.SITI March 18, 1886, page 215.9*

The above is a good exposition of *James 2:10, 11*. We learn, then, that when a man willfully violates one commandment, it is not respect for the law, nor for the Lawgiver, that restrains him from violating all of them. He has shown his contempt for the authority that gave them, and thus becomes guilty of all. Now when we recall the fact that each one of these commandments reaches the thoughts and intents of the heart, we may have something of a sense of what it takes to be a doer of the law. If it is thought that there is even one human being who merits that title, read the following plain declarations:-*SITI March 18, 1886, page 215.10*

“For we have before proved both Jews and Gentiles that they are all under sin; as it is written, There is none righteous, no, not one; there is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way; they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one. Their throat is an open sepulcher; with their tongues they have used deceit; the poison of asps is under their lips; whose mouth is full of cursing and bitterness; their feet are swift to shed blood; destruction and misery are in their ways; and the way of peace they have not known; there is no fear of God before their eyes. Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law; that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God.” *Romans 3:9-19.SITI March 18, 1886, page 215.11*

After reading the above, you will have no difficulty in understanding why the apostle immediately adds:-*SITI March 18, 1886, page 215.12*

“Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight; for by the law is the knowledge of sin.” *Romans 3:20.SITI March 18, 1886, page 215.13*

It seems hardly possible that any one should now imagine that there is any disagreement between *Romans 2:13* and *Romans 3:20*. It is a fact that all must recognize, that the law will justify all doers of it; and it is just as certain that by the deeds of the law no flesh can be justified, because there is no one of whom it can be said, He is a doer of the law. It is not the fault of the law that it will not justify anybody; it would do so if it were possible; it is the fault of man that it cannot. E. J. W.*SITI March 18, 1886, page 215.14*

“Forgiveness; Real, not Figurative” The Signs of the Times, 12, 11.

E. J. Waggoner

There is probably no one who gives the matter any consideration, who doubts that the offerings for sin, under the Levitical law, represented the real sacrifice made by Christ; although there are very many who fail to notice that the service performed by the priests was only a type of the real service which is conducted by Christ, our great High Priest, in the true sanctuary in Heaven. The Scriptures, however, give abundant evidence of the fact that the tabernacle built in the wilderness was but a pattern of “the true tabernacle which the Lord pitched, and not man;” that the high priest was a type of Christ; and that, in short, the whole service was typical, or figurative.*SITI March 18, 1886, page 168.1*

But here some are liable to make a mistake. Many suppose that because the service of the sanctuary was only figurative, therefore the forgiveness which the sinner is said to have received was also only figurative. The fallacy of this supposition will be apparent if a comprehensive view is taken of the whole subject. It will be remembered that the figurative sanctuary service continued until Christ made the real sacrifice on the cross. Then if the supposition noted were true, it would appear that before the time of Christ no sinner had really been forgiven. But Elijah went to Heaven, and therefore his sins must certainly have been forgiven. David says: “I acknowledged my sin unto thee, and mine iniquity have I not hid. I

said, I will confess my transgressions unto the Lord; and thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin." *Psalm 32:5*. That is positive proof of sins actually pardoned. Therefore we must conclude that sins were pardoned *in fact*, before the time of Christ. *SITI March 18, 1886, page 168.2*

"But," asks one in astonishment, "do you think that there was any virtue in the blood of bulls and goats to take away sin?" Not at all; neither do we believe that there is any virtue in the mechanical act of baptism; yet we are commanded to be baptized as a condition of securing remission of sins. What is it that secures our forgiveness? It is the death and resurrection of Christ (*Romans 4:25*); it is not by the mere act of baptism, but by the faith which is thereby indicated, that we secure pardon for transgressions. So in the case of the man in the Levitical age. He was forgiven, not through any virtue in the blood of the goat or bullock which he offered, but by virtue of his faith in Christ's sacrifice, which he manifested by offering an animal that typified Christ. *SITI March 18, 1886, page 168.3*

We must not lose sight of the fact that the plan of salvation has not varied in the least since the days of Adam. When man first sinned; then Christ was given as a ransom. It was then that Christ voluntarily offered to die in man's stead; it was then that God's love to the world led him to consent to deliver up his only begotten son; it was then that the promise of life through Christ was made to the human race. Now a *promise* on the part of God is just as sure as a thing that is actually performed; for he cannot lie. And for this reason it is that Christ is said to have been "slain from the foundation of the world." It made no difference that the death was not accomplished until four thousand years after the fall; from the time the promise was made, forgiveness of sins through the blood of Christ was just as certain to the man who repented as it is to-day. *SITI March 18, 1886, page 168.4*

Notice the exact parallel between the case of men in the days before Christ and that of those after Christ. They had ceremonies by which they manifested their faith in Christ; and because of this faith they were forgiven. We have ceremonies (as baptism and the Lord's Supper) by which we manifest our faith in Christ; and because of our faith we obtain the forgiveness of our sins. They

looked forward by faith to the time when Christ, according to the promise, should be offered; we look backward to the cross and we see the promise actually fulfilled. *SITI March 18, 1886, page 168.5*

But while their sins were forgiven in fact, they were blotted out only in figure. Even in this the parallel holds good; for the sins of men now living, although forgiven, have not yet been blotted out. The exhortation to us is, "Repent ye therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord." *Acts 3:19*. And because the way of salvation is uniform throughout, and God deals with men in the same way in all ages of the world, we do not like the terms "old dispensation" and "new dispensation;" or "Jewish dispensation" and "gospel dispensation." Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, lived in the "gospel age" as well as we. See *Galatians 3:8*. The gospel is the good news of salvation through Christ, and the patriarchs understood that as well as we do. Forgiveness of sins has always been granted immediately upon repentance; and Christ's blood was of just as much efficacy four thousand years ago as it is to-day. "Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." *Acts 4:12*. E. J. W. *SITI March 18, 1886, page 168.6*

March 25, 1886

“Unleavened Bread at Communion” *The Signs of the Times*, 12, 12.

E. J. Waggoner

QUESTION.-“What kind of bread should be used in a celebration of the Lord’s Supper? Some say that unleavened bread alone should be used; others argue for leavened bread; and still others say that it makes no difference. Which is right? G. C. I.”*SITI March 25, 1886, page 183.1*

ANSWER.-To answer categorically, we should say that only unleavened should be used in the celebration of the Lord’s Supper. The reasons for this answer are as follows:-*SITI March 25, 1886, page 183.2*

1. By using the bread we follow the example of Christ. The Lord’s Supper was instituted by Christ in connection with the last Passover (*Matthew 26:17-30*), and it is certain that only unleavened bread was used on that occasion; because during the whole of the Passover week, no particle of leaven was allowed in the Jewish dwelling. The law on this point was very restrict. See *Exodus 12:18-20*. This may be said to be only negative testimony; but it is more than can be produced in favor of leavened bread. If in the absence of positive command, we follow the example of Christ, we certainly cannot go wrong. But this is not all that we have.*SITI March 25, 1886, page 183.3*

2. The Lord’s Supper is designed to represent the death of Christ. See *1 Corinthians 11:26*. It is a memorial of that which was foreshadowed by the Passover and by all the sacrifices of the old ceremonial law. There is, therefore, the same reason for using unleavened bread in the Lord’s Supper that there was for using it in the passover. When Christ broke the bread, he said: “This is my body, which is broken for you.” *1 Corinthians 11:14*. since the bread of the communion represents Christ’s body, it must be without blemish, or else it is not a fit symbol; for Peter says: “Ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers;

but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot.” 1 *Peter* 1:18, 19. Now leaven is a fermentation, and fermentation is decomposition and decay. Then certainly leavened bread cannot officially represent the spotless body of Christ, any more than leavened or fermented wine can properly represent his precious blood. Therefore we hold that it was no accident which led to the use of unleavened bread at the institution of the Lord’s Supper. *SITI March 25, 1886, page 183.4*

3. This conclusion is verified by *Exodus* 23:18, which reads thus: “Thou shalt not offer the blood of my sacrifice with leavened bread.” This is a positive commandment, and leaves us no choice in the matter. It cannot be said that this applies only to the sacrifices under the old ceremonial law; for they were no more the blood of the Lord’s sacrifice than is the cup of the Lord’s Supper. Indeed, the Bible speaks more plainly of this than it does of those; for Christ himself said, when he took the cup: “*This is my blood* of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.” *Matthew* 26:28. It is plain enough that *Exodus* 23:18 does not refer to the literal blood of Christ; for no man ever offered, or could offer that with anything; and it is equally plain that it does not refer to anything that was or used to represent Christ’s blood, whether before or after his death. *SITI March 25, 1886, page 183.5*

In view of the reasons here given, and especially of the explicit commandment in *Exodus* 23:18, we think we are justified in saying not only that it is right to use unleavened bread at communion, but that it is wrong to use any other. It may seem to some a trifling matter, but nothing can be a trifling matter upon which the Lord has seen fit to give the commandment. E. J. W. *SITI March 25, 1886, page 183.6*

“Justified by Faith” The Signs of the Times, 12, 12.

E. J. Waggoner

Before going further, let us have some definitions to keep in our mind. *Justification* is “a showing to be just, or conformable to law, rectitude, or propriety.” *Condemnation* is “the judicial act of declaring guilty, and dooming to punishment.” The two words are

directly opposite in meaning; and we have the inspired declaration that all the world are guilty (condemned) before God, and that by the deeds of the law none can be justified.*SITI March 25, 1886, page 183.7*

That there may be no possibility of a mistake, we will compare *Romans 2:13* and *3:20* a little further. Both are true, but they do not both apply to the same classes. The first is a universal truth. The *doers* of the law, wherever or whenever they are found, are justified. It cannot be otherwise. But in this world there are no doers of the law. There may be many who are trying to do it; but whatever degree of success they may have, they cannot be called *doers* of the law, for they have repeatedly broken it. Suppose now that it were possible for a man to turn squarely around and keep the law perfectly, would he be justified? By no means. The law requires that *all there is of us* shall be devoted to it *all the time*. Then if a man gets behind, he can never catch up. Since all our strength is required for each hour, it is plain that the perfect performance of duty during any hour will not in the least degree make up for the non-performance of duty during any other hour. There can be no such thing as works of supererogation. While the law justifies us in the performance of good deeds, it cannot, as a matter of fact, justify us for a single moment, no matter how good our present actions may be, since on its very first application to us, it must detect the past sin, and consequently must at once condemn us. Justification and condemnation have reference to our whole lives; and since, however good we may be, for a portion of our lives, at the end, it will be seen that we have not done *all* our duty, we must therefore stand condemned. The law is just and good, and therefore it can never declare a guilty man innocent.*SITI March 25, 1886, page 183.8*

Is there, then, no hope for any? Since all have sinned, must all receive the wages-death? Will the law with its unrelenting grasp forever hold all the world in the bondage of death? Such would be the case, and there would be no hope for any, had not "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." *John 3:16*. All the world are guilty before God, because all have sinned; but they may be "justified freely by his grace through the

redemption that is in Christ Jesus.” *Romans 3:24*. There is “hope in the Lord; for with the Lord there is mercy, and with him is plenteous redemption.” *Psalms 130:7*. Let us read Paul’s brief but wonderfully clear statement of how we may be justified:-*SITI March 25, 1886, page 183.9*

“Being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus; whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare, I say, at this time his righteousness; that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus.” *Romans 3:24-26*.*SITI March 25, 1886, page 183.10*

Take notice that this is not indulgence for sin, nor remission of the law, but *remission of sins*. The sins are remitted-sent away. By this process, the sins are taken from the individual, so that he may be counted as though he had never committed them. Note also the fact that it is by the grace of God that we are justified, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus. There is no antagonism between the Father and the Son; both are concerned in the great work of man’s redemption. The death of Christ, inasmuch as the Lord “laid upon him the iniquity of us all” (*Isaiah 53:6*), made it possible for God to justify those who have faith in his blood.*SITI March 25, 1886, page 183.11*

“To declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past.” Christ’s righteousness was perfect. He delighted to do the will of God, because the law-God’s will-was within his heart. *Psalms 40:8*. He “did no sin, neither was guilt found in his mouth.” *1 Peter 2:22*. He alone, of all the people who ever trod this earth, could challenge even his enemies to find in his life one trace of sin. *John 8:46*. We have learned that righteousness is obedience to the law. Now it is because of unrighteousness-disobedience to the law-that man is condemned. If by any means a man’s whole life could be made to appear in perfect harmony with the law, it is evident that that man would be justified. It is also evident that if the sins of his life could be removed, his life would appear in harmony with the law of God. Now this is just what is done. Christ’s righteousness is declared for the remission-taking away-of those sins. As Christ’s life

is worth infinitely more than the lives of all the world, so through his death his righteousness may be made to take the place of the disobedience of all those who will have faith in him. We may say that an exchange is made; Christ takes upon himself the sins of all our past life, and in return lets his righteousness be counted as ours. When this is done for a man, the law can do no other than justify him. It demands perfect obedience in the life, and that is what it finds. It matters not to the law that the obedience which it finds in the man's life is not really his own; it is counted as his own; and since the obedience is perfect, the law cannot condemn. Christ suffered the penalty for the sins which the man actually committed (*Isaiah 53:6, 10; 2 Corinthians 5:21; 1 Peter 2:24*), and thus God can be perfectly just and at the same time may justify a man who has sinned. But this can be done only for those who have faith in Christ's blood. *SITI March 25, 1886, page 183.12*

It must not be forgotten that we are now speaking only of the sins that are *past*. It is impossible that *remission* of sins could have reference to anything else, for that which does not exist cannot be taken away; and to justify a man for sins not yet committed, in other words, to grant indulgence for sins, would throw contempt on the law, and bring in anarchy and ruin. And no sins are remitted, except of those who believe in Jesus. If any are Christ's, they are Abraham's seed (*Galatians 3:29*), and therefore, with him, their faith is imputed unto them for righteousness. *James 2:23. SITI March 25, 1886, page 183.13*

"Therefore," says Paul, "we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law." *Romans 3:28*. This does not mean that the law is ignored, and that a man who disregards the law can be justified. Nothing of the kind. There could be no justification in such a case; for justification has no connection with injustice, and to clear a guilty man—a violator of the law—is an act of injustice. The Lord says that he "will not at all acquit the wicked" (*Nahum 1:3*), and he does not; for the blood of Christ cleanses from all sin (*1 John 1:7*), and when this is applied to an individual, as it is to all who have faith in it, it frees him from guilt, and then he must necessarily stand justified. But the man could not be justified if the law were left out of the account; for justification, as we have already learned, is "a showing to be just or conformable to law." *SITI March 25, 1886,*

But this will not be done for a man who does not acknowledge the justice of the law which condemns his sins, and, repeating of them, promise obedience to the law. No just governor would pardon a man under any other circumstances. Here is a man who has been convicted of theft; he petitions for a pardon, but unless he promises to reform, he will not be likely to get it. If he persists that he has a right to steal, and has no intention of reforming, nothing can secure his pardon. Of course this is not a perfect parallel to the sinner pleading with God for forgiveness; for when a man receives pardon from an earthly ruler, his guilt remains the same as ever; but when he receives a pardon from God, the same blood which secures the pardon, takes away the sin. *SITI March 25, 1886, page 184.2*

The statement that a man is justified by faith, without the deeds of the law, is only a summing up of Paul's argument, which we have already given. No amount of work will have the slightest effect in securing justification by the remission of past sins. That which is done, we cannot undo. *SITI March 25, 1886, page 184.3*

Nothing that we can do can alter the fact that we have sinned. Your past life has been full of sin, and you want to become free from the guilt of it; what can you do? Though you were able to keep the law without the slightest deviation, that would not remove a single sin. You can do nothing but "believe on the Lord Jesus Christ." He says: "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden [with sin], and I will give you rest." *Matthew 11:28*. The blood of Jesus Christ, and that alone, can cleanse from sin. So we conclude, with Paul, that "a man is justified by faith, without the deeds of the law." *SITI March 25, 1886, page 184.4*

We have said that no work of ours, however perfect it may be, can atone for past transgressions; that even though we should be able to turn around and keep the law perfectly, that would not remove a single sin. As a matter of fact, however, it is impossible for the sinner to do any good work, even though it would be counted in his justification. "The carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." *Romans 8:7*. "The flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh; and

these are contrary the one to the other; so that ye *cannot do the things that ye would.*" *Galatians 5:17*. This means, of course, while we are serving the flesh, and out of Christ; for Christ says: "Without me ye can do nothing." *John 15:5*. This was said to those whose sins had been forgiven, and will certainly apply, with all its force, to those who have never known Christ. Christ says that "out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies." *Matthew 15:19*. These are the works of the flesh (see the complete list in *Galatians 5:19-21*), and are what men do by nature. Men may have good desires, but they cannot do what they would. *Galatians 5:17*. The law of God is so extensive and perfect in its requirements that the best efforts of fallen man, unassisted, must fall far short of it. And this thought makes us understand still more clearly the statement that a man is justified by faith, without the deeds of the law; for every act that the man performs before he comes to Christ, no matter how good his intentions may be, only sinks him the deeper in condemnation. *SITI March 25, 1886, page 184.5*

"Not all our groans and tears,
Nor works which we have done,
Nor vows, nor promises, nor prayers,
Can e'er for sin atone.
"Relief alone is found
In Jesus' precious blood;
'Tis this that heals the mortal wound
And reconciles to God." *SITI March 25, 1886, page 184.6*

And so the sinner, appalled at the multitude of his sins, which like a mountain upon his back well-nigh sink him into despair, having lost all confidence in himself, may sing:-*SITI March 25, 1886, page 184.7*

"Just as I am,-without one plea,
But that thy blood was shed for me,
And that thou bid'st me come to thee,
O, Lamb of God, I come.
"Just as I am-and waiting not
To rid my soul of one dark blot,
To thee, whose blood can cleanse each spot,

O, Lamb of God, I come." E. J. W. *SITI* March 25, 1886, page 184.8

April 1, 1886

“Justification and Sanctification” The Signs of the Times, 12, 13.

E. J. Waggoner

Having explained *Romans 3:28*, we are prepared to understand a parallel text that, without the explanation already given, might be considered a difficult one. The text referred to is *Romans 3:21*: “But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets.” The righteousness of God, as we have already learned, is a term applied to the ten commandments, or rather to that righteousness which the ten commandments enjoin. But the question arises, “If the righteousness of God is the perfect righteousness which the law demands, how can it be manifested “without the law?” Let Paul explain for himself, as he does in the following verses: “*Even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe*; for there is no difference; for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus; whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God.” *Romans 3:22-25. SITI April 1, 1886, page 199.1*

By this we see that the righteousness of God which is manifested without the law, is simply the remission of sins that are past, for which no works of obedience on our part could make any satisfaction. Paul, speaking of Abraham, describes it as follows: “He staggered not at the promise of God through unbelief; but was strong in faith, giving glory to God; and being fully persuaded that, what he had promised, he was able also to perform. And therefore it was imputed to him for righteousness. Now it was not written for his sake alone, that it was imputed to him; But for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe on him that raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead; who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification.” *Romans 4:20-25. SITI April 1, 1886, page 200.1*

“Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness.” The same thing, says Paul, will be done to us also, if we also believe. The case, then, stands thus: The law demands perfect and unvarying obedience, but it speaks to all the world and finds none righteous; all have violated it, and all are condemned by it. (*Romans 3:9, 19.*) Present or future obedience will not take away past transgression, therefore the law cannot help us. But Christ is perfect righteousness, for in him dwells “all the fullness of the Godhead bodily.” Now God says that he will impute the righteousness of Christ to every one who will fully believe on him. Impute means, “to set to the account of.” Therefore we are to understand that whenever we accept Christ, his righteousness is set to our account. Thus “the righteousness of God” is manifested in our past lives, even though we ourselves have never done a single act of righteousness. So we have the wonder of perfect obedience to the law, without a single righteous act on our part. The righteousness of God without the law—Christ’s righteousness imputed to us.*SITI April 1, 1886, page 200.2*

But what is the law doing all this time? Has it relaxed its claims? Not at all. Paul says, “The righteousness of God without the law is manifested, *being witnessed by the law.*” The law stands by, and witnesses to the righteousness that is thus manifested in our past life. Whereas it before condemned us, now it justifies us, for in the righteousness that is imputed to us it can detect no flaw. It makes no difference to the law that the righteousness to which it witnesses is not the result of our own works; the righteousness is accounted as ours, and that satisfies the law.*SITI April 1, 1886, page 200.3*

Right here we may profitably note the force of *Romans 5:20*: “Moreover the law entered that the offense might abound. But where sin abounded, grace did much more abound.” The “entering” of the law refers to the formal giving of it from Sinai. This will be readily seen from *Romans 5:13, 14*, and has already been noted in our comments on that passage. Before the giving of the law, from Sinai, it did not exist in written form in the world. The remains of the law “written in their hearts,” and the instruction of men who, like Enoch, and Noah, walked with God were what the people had to depend on for their knowledge of right and wrong. The law existed before that time, for sin was imputed to the people, and “sin is not

imputed where there is no law.” But the law was given “that the offense might abound.” The apostle does not mean that the law was given so that there might be more sin, but that it was given so that the sin which already existed *might abound*, that is, might appear greater than it did before. Paul expresses the exact meaning in another place when he says that sin, by the commandment, became “exceeding sinful.” *SITI April 1, 1886, page 200.4*

To illustrate: Here stands a glass of water; it does not look perfectly pure, yet it does not seem very impure. Now a rod is thrust down to the bottom of the glass and given a few vigorous turns, when, behold, the water at once becomes exceedingly foul. Did the rod make the water impure? No; the impurity was there all the time; the rod simply made it appear. So there was sin in the world; but the law, when it was written on tables of stone, and copies could be multiplied in books, and scattered among the people, made the extreme hideousness of sin to appear. And why was this necessary? The answer is implied in the last clause of the verse: “But where sin abounded, grace did much more abound.” Men could not be saved while defiled by sin, even though they did not realize its heinousness. So the law was brought close to them, to show them their deformity, and make them feel their need of help from some source outside of themselves. And this effect it had; for no matter how much their sins were made to abound, “grace did much more abound.” Christ’s righteousness was seen to be sufficient to cover all the sins of the past. With Wesley, the repentant sinner may sing: -*SITI April 1, 1886, page 200.5*

“Plenteous grace with Thee is found,
Grace to cover all my sin;” *SITI April 1, 1886, page 200.6*

and with David he can realize the blessedness of the man “whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered,” and unto whom the Lord will not impute iniquity. *SITI April 1, 1886, page 200.7*

We have seen that the law stands as a witness to the sinner’s justification. This shows that no act of Christ has in any way robbed the law of its force. Indeed, without the existence of the law there could be no such thing as justification. Now what about the man’s future relation to the law? It is evident that unless he keeps it he will

again fall into condemnation. The man's faith secured his justification; but that justification was simply the "showing to be just, or conformable to law." His justification was simply pardon for having violated the law; it was an act by which another's righteousness was put in place of his unrighteousness. Now since "faith without works is dead," it follows as a necessary conclusion, that if the man's faith was genuine (and if it were not he could not have been pardoned), it will now be proved by works of obedience. And therefore the characteristic of the justified man is that he keeps the law.*SITI April 1, 1886, page 200.8*

Of Abraham it is said that his faith was imputed to him for righteousness. But James takes the same subject up and says, "Was not Abraham our father justified by works, when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar?" *James 2:21*. This is no contradiction of Paul's statement in *Romans 3:28*; for James immediately adds: "Seest thou how faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect? And the Scripture was fulfilled which saith, Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness." *Verses 22, 23. SITI April 1, 1886, page 200.9*

By this we see that Abraham's faith could not have been imputed to him for righteousness but for the disposition to work. And since justification has reference to the law of God, it is evident that the works that make perfect the faith that secures justification, must be the works which the law requires. But this continued obedience is sanctification; for Christ prayed for his disciples: "Sanctify them through thy truth; thy word is truth." *John 17:17. SITI April 1, 1886, page 200.10*

Paul says that God has chosen us to salvation "through sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth" (*2 Thessalonians 2:17*); but that by which the Spirit acts is the word of God, which is the sword of the Spirit. *Ephesians 6:17. SITI April 1, 1886, page 200.11*

Again Paul says: "Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling." *Philippians 2:12*. But no one can accuse Paul of inconsistency; for he adds: "For it is God which worketh in you both

to will and to do of his good pleasure.” This is exactly in accord with our Saviour’s words: “Abide in me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; no more can ye, except ye abide in me. I am the vine, ye are the branches; he that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit: for without me ye can do nothing.” *John 15:4, 5. SITI April 1, 1886, page 200.12*

Peter also bears the same testimony. He says: “Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit unto unfeigned love of the brethren, see that ye love one another with a pure heart fervently.” *1 Peter 1:22*. God’s law is the truth (*Psalms 119:142*), and to purify is to cleanse from guilt or defilement, to sanctify. So Peter’s sentence is that we are sanctified by obeying the truth; but he adds that this is done “through the Spirit.” Sanctification, then, is the result of obedience; but as obedience is not simply a momentary act, but the work of a lifetime, it follows that sanctification is not an instantaneous, but a progressive work. A man is justified as soon as he exercises true faith in Christ; but the work of sanctification goes on as long as there is any truth for him to obey. And since a man, after he has been justified by faith, would fall into condemnation if he should refuse to do any duty that was presented to him, and can only retain his state of justification by continuing in obedience to the law, it may be said that sanctification is but continued justification. Each new duty only makes the performance of others possible, and so “the path of the just is as the shining light that shineth more and more unto the perfect day.” *SITI April 1, 1886, page 200.13*

“Faith without works is dead;” and on the other hand, obedience without faith is impossible, as is shown by our Saviour’s words in *John 15:4, 5*; also by the words of Paul. “They that are in the flesh cannot please God.” *Romans 8:8*. The man who is destitute of faith in Christ cannot keep the law, or do any act that is really good. In our best efforts there is so much imperfection, that but for the continual imputation of Christ’s righteousness to make up for our deficiencies, we should be lost. The best that we alone can do is bad. Without faith it is impossible to please God. *Hebrews 11:6*. And thus we see the force of the words: “This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith.” *1 John 5:4. SITI April 1, 1886,*

“Where is boasting, then? It is excluded. By what law? of works? Nay; but by the law of faith.” *Romans 3:27*. The redeemed saint will have no cause for boasting over the lost sinner. True, the law, when applied to their lives, reports perfection in the one case, and only sin in the other; but the saint cannot boast, for without Christ he would have been nothing. If Christ had not put his own righteousness upon him, he would be in as hopeless a condition as the sinner. And to all eternity the redeemed host will join with the heavenly choir in saying, “Worthy is the Lamb that was slain, to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing.” *Revelation 5:12*. *SITI April 1, 1886, page 200.15*

“That no flesh should glory in his presence. But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption.” *1 Corinthians 1:29, 30*. *SITI April 1, 1886, page 200.16*

“And this is his name whereby he shall be called, THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS.” *Jeremiah 23:6*. E. J. W. *SITI April 1, 1886, page 200.17*

April 8, 1886

“Punishment and Torment” The Signs of the Times, 12, 14.

E. J. Waggoner

A reader of the SIGNS sends the following: *SITI April 8, 1886, page 215.1*

“Your number of March 11, in ‘Notes on the International Lessons,’ says the doctrine of the eternal torment is contrary to the word of God. Will you please explain *Matthew 25:41*, Christ’s own words? I have had faith in your papers; its teachings compared in many respects to my belief. But without satisfactory explanations in this doctrine, my faith will have some doubts on other subjects.” *SITI April 8, 1886, page 215.2*

The last verse of the 25th of Matthew reach thus: “And the [the wicked] shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal.” We believe that this verse will be literally fulfilled. We know, also, that the words “everlasting” and “eternal” in this verse from the same in the Greek, and have the same meaning in the English; and therefore the text teaches that the punishment of the wicked will last just as long as the reward of the righteous. Our friend must certainly agree with us thus far. *SITI April 8, 1886, page 215.3*

Now what will be the punishment of the wicked? “The wages of sin is death.” *Romans 6:23*. Then since the punishment of the wicked is everlasting, it must be everlasting death—a death from which there is no awaking. Paul also in another place says that they “shall be punished with everlasting *destruction*.” *2 Thessalonians 1:9*. *SITI April 8, 1886, page 215.4*

Our friend has confused the words “punishment” and “torment.” They are not synonymous terms. Whatever torment the wicked may suffer, they cannot be said to have *been punished* until they have suffered death; for the wages of sin is death. The “tribulation and anguish” which will be rendered to them may be a very long continuance; but their *punishment* consists in death. And this

punishment-will be everlasting. To all eternity the wicked will “be as though they had not been.” *Obadiah 16.SITI April 8, 1886, page 215.5*

The 41st person of *Matthew 25* reads as follows: “Then shall he say also wanted them on the left hand, depart from me, ye cursed, and everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels.” This does not in the least contradict the explanation just given. Everlasting or eternal fire does not necessarily imply that its victims must exist eternally. How was it with Sodom and Gomorrah? The Lord rained fire and brimstone upon them, and they were consumed from off the face of the earth. Nothing marks where they once stood, and is supposed that the waters of the Dead Sea roll over it. They have no existence, yet the apostle says: “Even as Sodom and Gomorrah, and the cities about them in like manner, giving themselves over to fornication, and going after strange flesh, are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of *eternal fire*.” *Jude 7*. If “eternal fire” resulted in the complete destruction of the cities of the plain, it must have a like edict on those who are finally impenitent. Indeed, the connection shows that the destruction of those cities was an example of the final fate of the wicked. On this passage Dr. Barnes says:-*SITI April 8, 1886, page 215.6*

“The phrase ‘eternal fire,’ is one that is often used to denote future punishment-as expressing the severity and intensity of the suffering. As here used, it cannot mean that the fires that consumed Sodom and Gomorrah were literally eternal, or were kept always burning, for that was not true. The expression seems to denote, in this connection, two things: (1) That the destruction of the cities of the plain, with their inhabitants, was as entire and perpetual *as if* the fires had been always burning-the consumption was absolute and enduring-the sinners were wholly cut off, and the cities were for ever rendered desolate; and (2) That in its nature and duration this was a striking emblem of the destruction which will come upon the ungodly.”*SITI April 8, 1886, page 215.7*

One word concerning the position taken by one correspondent. He says that he has had faith in the SIGNS, because its teachings corresponded to his belief. While we are pleased to have people favor the SIGNS, we do not like to have the favor rest on that

foundation. If a men accept only what he already believes, he will make no advancement, and may only be confirmed in error; but if he accepts whatever is demonstrated to be truth, whether it accords with his previous belief not, he will always be in the right. This is in accordance with the apostolic injunction: "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good." *1 Thessalonians 5:21*. E. J. W.*SITI April 8, 1886, page 215.8*

"Christ the End of the Law" The Signs of the Times, 12, 14.

E. J. Waggoner

In the preceding articles we have considered the fundamental principles of the law, and all its bearings. We have by no means exhausted the subject; for that would be impossible; neither have we referred to all the texts relating to it; but we have given an outline of the nature of the law, its origin, perpetuity, extent of jurisdiction, and the relation to it of both righteous and wicked. By the principles of the law, which have already been enunciated, every text in the Bible that mentions the law may be explained; and bearing those principles in mind, we shall now proceed to consider the application of some texts that are too often regarded as antagonistic to the law. Without a knowledge of the principles of the law, these texts may justly be considered as difficult; but with such knowledge, we find not only that they are in perfect harmony with those principles, but that they greatly strengthen the argument already made. Right here, we will say that the task of "harmonizing" different portions of the Bible, is one which no man has to perform. The different portions of the Bible were harmonized by inspiration; all that the expositor has to do is to point out the harmony that already exists.*SITI April 8, 1886, page 215.9*

In *Romans 10:4* we read as follows: "For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth." Before showing what this text means, it may be well to briefly show what it does not mean. It does not mean that Christ has put an end to the law because (1) Christ himself said concerning the law: "I am not come to destroy," *Matthew 5:17*. (2) The prophet said that instead of destroying it, the Lord would "magnify the law, and make it honorable." *Isaiah 42:21*. (3) The law was in Christ's own heart.

“Then said I, Lo, I come; in the volume of the book it is written of me, I delight to do thy will, O my God; yea, thy law is within my heart.” *Psalm 40:7, 8*. And (4) since the law is the righteousness of God, the foundation of his Government, it could not by any possibility be abolished. See *Luke 16:17*. *SITI April 8, 1886, page 215.10*

A reading of the verses preceding the one quoted should suggest its meaning. “Brethren, my heart’s desire and prayer to God for Israel is, that they might be saved. For I bear them record that they have a zeal of God, but not according to knowledge. For they, being ignorant of God’s righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God.” *Romans 10:1-3*. Bear in mind that “the righteousness of God” is his law. *Isaiah 51:6, 7*. We can see that Paul uses the term in this sense; for, without any break for explanation, he adds, “For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness,” etc. *SITI April 8, 1886, page 215.11*

From these verses we learn that Paul, instead of teaching that the law has come to an end, is showing that Israel, through ignorance, had failed to realize the design of the law in securing righteousness. What had caused this failure? Paul says it was because they were ignorant of God’s righteousness, and went about to establish their own righteousness. They had such low views of the righteousness of God, as required by his law, that they thought they could make themselves righteous. But, as we have already seen, all men are sinful, and while in the flesh cannot please God. *Romans 8:8*. The only way in which men can appear as righteous, is to have that “righteousness which is by faith of Jesus Christ.” When their faith is imputed to them for righteousness, they become, in Christ, new creatures (*2 Corinthians 5:17*), and thenceforth it is possible that with them all things shall be of God. But the Jews rejected Christ, and therefore failed to secure that righteousness which the law was designed to perfect in man. A comparison of Scripture texts will show that the view here outlined is the correct one. *SITI April 8, 1886, page 216.1*

The reader must know that the word “end” does not necessarily mean “termination.” It is often used in the sense of design, object,

or purpose. For instances where it is so used, see *James 5:11; John 18:37; Romans 14:9; Amos 5:18; Luke 18:1; Hebrews 13:7; 1 Peter 1:9*. In reading these texts no one would get the idea that faith is ended, or that the Lord had ceased to exist. So in reading *Romans 10:4*, even without an explanation, one need not suppose that “end” means cessation of existence. *SITI April 8, 1886, page 216.2*

Now for a more detailed exposition of the text. In *1 Timothy 1:5*, the same writer says: “Now the end of the commandment is charity out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned.” The word here rendered “charity” is often rendered “love,” and is so rendered in this place in the New Version. In *John 5:3*, we read: “This is the love of God, that we keep his commandments;” and Paul himself says that “love is the fulfilling of the law.” *Romans 13:10*. In both these texts, the same word (*agape*) is used that occurs in *1 Timothy 1:5*. Therefore we say that this text means, Now the design of the commandment (or law) is that it should be kept. Everybody will recognize this as a self-evident fact. *SITI April 8, 1886, page 216.3*

But this is not the ultimate design of the law. In the verse following the one under consideration Paul quotes Moses as saying of the law that “the man that doeth those things shall live by them.” Christ said to the young man, “If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments.” *Matthew 19:17*. Now since the design of the law was that it should be kept, or, in other words, that it should produce righteous characters, and the promise is that those who are obedient shall live, we may say that the ultimate design of the law was to give life. And in harmony with this thought are the words of Paul, that the law “was ordained to life.” *Romans 7:10. SITI April 8, 1886, page 216.4*

But “all have sinned and come short of the glory of God,” and “the wages of sin is death.” Thus it is impossible for the law to accomplish its design in making perfect characters and consequently giving life. When a man has once broken the law, no subsequent obedience can ever make his character perfect. And therefore the law which was ordained unto life, is found to be unto death. *Romans 7:10. SITI April 8, 1886, page 216.5*

If we were to stop right here, with the law unable to accomplish its purpose, we should leave all the world under condemnation, and sentence of death. Now we shall see that Christ enables man to secure both righteousness and life. We read that we are “justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus.” *Romans 3:24*. “Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ.” *Romans 5:1*. More than this, he enables us to keep the law. “For he [God] hath made him [Christ] to be sin for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him.” *2 Corinthians 5:21*. In Christ, therefore, it is possible for us to made perfect,-the righteousness of God,-and that is just what we would have been by constant and unvarying obedience to the law. *SITI April 8, 1886, page 216.6*

Again we read: “There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.... For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh; that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.” *Romans 8:1-4. SITI April 8, 1886, page 216.7*

What could not the law do? It could not free a single guilty soul from condemnation. Why not? Because it was “weak through the flesh.” There is no element of weakness in the law; the weakness is in the flesh. It is not the fault of a good tool that it cannot make a sound pillar out of a rotten stick. The law could not cleanse a man’s past record, and make him sinless; and poor, fallen man had no strength resting in his flesh to enable him to keep the law. And so God imputes to believers the righteousness of Christ, who was made in the likeness of sinful flesh, so that “the righteousness of the law” might be fulfilled in their lives. And thus Christ is the end of the law. *SITI April 8, 1886, page 216.8*

But life is promised to the obedient, and as Christ enables his people to obey the law, he thus secures to them eternal life. Paul says that Christ has “brought life and immortality to light through the gospel.” *2 Timothy 1:10*. Christ himself says: “I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly.” *John 10:10*. “For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten

Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." *John 3:16*. And because Christ meets the end or design of the law which was ordained to life, he is called our life, as Paul says: "When Christ, who is our life, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with him in glory." *Colossians 3:4*. *SITI April 8, 1886, page 216.9*

To conclude, then, we have found that the design of the law was that it should give life because of obedience. All men have sinned, and been sentenced to death. But Christ took upon himself man's nature, and will impart of his own righteousness to those who accept his sacrifice, and finally, when they stand, through him, as doers of the law, he will fulfill to them its ultimate object, by crowning them with eternal life. And so we repeat, what we cannot too fully appreciate, that Christ is made unto us "wisdom and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption." E. J. W. *SITI April 8, 1886, page 216.10*

April 15, 1886

“Abolishing the Enmity” The Signs of the Times, 12, 15.

E. J. Waggoner

Although we have shown by repeated arguments and texts of Scripture, that the law endures forever, and have shown that Christ did not come to relax any of its claims, but that he is the “end of the law,” in that he enables sinners to keep it, and thus to secure the life to which the law was ordained, there is a text which to some may seem to be a contradiction, or which may at least cause confusion in their minds. That text, therefore, shall be our next study; it reads thus: “For he is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us; having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace.” *Ephesians 2:14, 15.* *SITI April 15, 1886, page 231.1*

“All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable.” *2 Timothy 3:16.* Therefore there can be no contradiction in the Bible, and the text just quoted cannot contradict those texts which say that the law cannot be abolished. Although a certain “law of commandments contained in ordinances” is spoken of as having been “abolished,” even before we study it, our faith in the integrity of the Scriptures forces us to conclude that in this text a law is referred to, different from that of which Christ said, “It is easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail.” *Luke 16:17.* *SITI April 15, 1886, page 231.2*

Let us contrast certain expressions. That which is abolished is said to have been “enmity;” but Paul says: “Love worketh no ill to his neighbor; therefore love is the fulfilling of the law.” *Romans 13:10.* And John says: “This is the love of God, that we keep his commandments; and his commandments are not grievous.” *1 John 5:3.* Certainly the same thing cannot be both love and enmity. Again Paul says: “The law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good.” *Romans 7:12.* Surely then it is not the law of God to which he applies the term “enmity.” He also says: “For I delight in

the law of God after the inward man.” *Romans 7:22*. But he would not delight in that which was enmity; therefore we *know* that *Ephesians 2:15* has no reference to the law of God, or ten commandments. *SITI April 15, 1886, page 231.3*

Go back now to the time when the law was given from Sinai. The record says that after God had spoken the ten commandments, “he added no more” (*Deuteronomy 5:22*); and we have seen that all that God spoke from the mount on the day of the assembly, was written by him on the two tables of stone, and that nothing but the ten commandments was so written. The people, however, could not know that God intended to speak no more than his own holy law, and they said to Moses: “Speak thou with us, and we will hear; but let not God speak with us, lest we die.” “Go thou near, and hear all that the Lord our God shall say; and speak thou unto us all that the Lord our God shall speak unto thee.” *Exodus 20:19; Deuteronomy 5:27*. *SITI April 15, 1886, page 231.4*

Accordingly God told Moses to say to the people, “Get you into your tents again.” “And the people stood afar off, and Moses drew near unto the thick darkness where God was.” *Deuteronomy 5:30; Exodus 20:21*. Moses was in the mount with God forty days, receiving instruction for the people; and the fact that the people received instruction through Moses, besides that which the Lord spoke to them directly, is thus noted in Nehemiah’s prayer: “Thou camest down also upon mount Sinai, and spakest with them from heaven, and gavest them right judgments, and true laws, good statutes and commandments; and madest known unto them thy holy Sabbath, and commandedst them precepts, statutes, and laws, by the hand of Moses thy servant.” *Nehemiah 9:13, 14*. *SITI April 15, 1886, page 231.5*

Those things which were given by the hand of Moses are recorded chiefly in Exodus, *chapters 25-30*, and in Leviticus. Among them were many burdensome ceremonies, -the requirement that every male should go up to Jerusalem three times in every year, circumcision, “diverse washings, and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of reformation.” *Hebrews 9:10*. We say that these ceremonies were burdensome, for Peter himself said that they were a yoke, “which neither *our* fathers nor we were able to

bear.” *Acts 15:10.SITI April 15, 1886, page 232.1*

Moreover, some of them, at least, were an “enmity,” or a cause of enmity, between the Jews and Gentiles. The ceremony of circumcision, which was designed to serve as a line of demarcation between the Jews and the Gentiles, was especially the cause of much enmity. The Jews regarded it as a sure proof of their superior sanctity, and therefore looked with contempt upon the uncircumcised Gentiles; while the Gentiles in turn hated the Jews, and despised their circumcision, looking upon it as little different from a badge of slavery. *Acts 11:2, 3* indicates how the Jews regarded those who were uncircumcised.*SITI April 15, 1886, page 232.2*

This rite of circumcision was done away in Christ. It was given to Abraham as a sign or “seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised.” *Romans 4:11*. Thus we see it was designed to mark a *real* separation, the separation which always exists between the righteous and the wicked. But when a Jew departed from God, his circumcision and separation from the Gentiles was only an outward form, a mockery. Paul assures us that real circumcision is “of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God.” *Romans 2:20*. God looks upon the heart, and demands that righteousness shall be from within, and not merely from without, as an outward sign. The man who is pure in heart is really separated from the world more completely than he could possibly be by any mere outward mark. And so “in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature.” *Galatians 6:15.SITI April 15, 1886, page 232.3*

Thus this source of enmity, which really served as a barrier to the Gentiles, was taken away. We say it served as a barrier to the Gentiles, because, being uncircumcised, they were held to be rejected of God, and would naturally make less effort to become his followers. The Jews, also, in their sectional pride and vain confidence, were really separated from the true Israel. But when this cause of enmity was removed, both could be united in one body by the cross, and so find peace. But after circumcision as an outward sign lost its force, the keeping of God’s holy law still

remained as a primary obligation. Said Paul: "Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing, but the keeping of the commandments of God." *1 Corinthians 7:19*. And the keeping of the commandments from the heart constitutes the true circumcision, whose praise is of God. *SITI April 15, 1886, page 232.4*

Among the "ordinances" there were also various sacrifices. In the fourth chapter of Leviticus we find an account of the sin-offerings. We cannot take time to go over the ground in detail, but simply refer the reader to that chapter, also *Leviticus 6:25-30; 10:16-18*, and *chapter 16*. In the service for sin, an innocent animal was substituted for the sinner, whose sins were confessed over it, and it was slain. Either the flesh or the blood was carried within the sanctuary, and the sinner was forgiven. On the last day of the year, a goat was slain as a sin-offering for all the people; its blood was taken within the sanctuary, and its body was burned. In every sacrifice for sin, the sin was considered as laid upon the substitute as a whole, and it was entirely consumed. *SITI April 15, 1886, page 232.5*

But these sacrifices did not atone for a single sin: "for it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins." *Hebrews 10:4*. The only one who can remove sin is the Lamb of God. *John 1:29*. He "appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." *Hebrews 9:26*. On him was laid "the iniquity of us all" (*Isaiah 53:6*), and he "bare our sins in his own body on the tree." *1 Peter 2:24*. After Christ's sacrifice, those typical sacrifices that could not take away sin, were no longer required, as we read: "Wherefore, when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me." *Hebrews 10:5*. And so it is literally true that "in his flesh" Christ abolished "the law of commandments contained in ordinances." So it is that we are required to eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, if we would have eternal life. *John 6:53-56. SITI April 15, 1886, page 232.6*

One thought more. Where these ordinances were abolished "in the flesh," it was "to make in himself of twain one new man, so making peace." And what alone can make peace? Let inspiration answer: "Great peace have they which love thy law; and nothing shall offend

them." *Psalm 119:165*. "O that thou hadst hearkened unto my commandments! then had thy peace been as a river, and thy righteousness as the waves of the sea." *Isaiah 48:18*. Paul, also, speaking of those who have sinned (i.e., transgressed the law), says, "And the way of peace have they not known." *Romans 3:17*. Therefore we see that instead of the ten commandments of God being abolished "in his flesh," they "stand fast forever and ever," and are the bond of union of the "one new man;" they are the basis of the peace which both Jews and Gentiles who believe may have with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ. *SITI April 15, 1886, page 232.7*

And so both those who are near, and those who were afar off, become together members of "the household of God," not settled on a new basis, but "built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief cornerstone." *Ephesians 2:20*. E. J. W. *SITI April 15, 1886, page 232.8*

"Is It a Whimsey?" The Signs of the Times, 12, 15.

E. J. Waggoner

A noted California clergyman says that the keeping of the seventh-day Sabbath is "a whimsey," and a prominent religious journal of the coast indorses the statement. A whimsey is, "a whim; a freak; a capricious notion." Let us see about this. About four thousand years ago a mountain in Arabia "was altogether on a smoke, because the Lord descended upon it in fire; and the smoke thereof ascended as a spoken of a furnace, and all whole mount quaked greatly." *Exodus 19:18*. "He came with ten thousands of his holy ones; from his right hand went forth a fiery law for them." *Deuteronomy 33:2*. This law was spoken by God himself "out of the midst of the fire, of the cloud, and of the thick darkness, with a great voice (*Deuteronomy 5:22*); and was written upon tables of stone. "The tables were the work of God, and the writing was the writing of God, graven upon the tables." *Exodus 32:16*. Of this law the psalmist says: "Thy word is true from the beginning; and every one of thy righteous judgments endureth forever." *Psalm 119:160*. And again: "And his commandments are sure. They stand fast for ever and ever, and are done in truth and uprightness." *Psalm 111:7, 8*. Christ

himself said that “one jot or one tittle” should in no wise pass from the law (*Matthew 5:18*), and that “it is it easier for heaven and earth to pass, than one tittle of the law to fail.” *Luke 16:17.SITI April 15, 1886, page 232.9*

And now we find that the commandments which were spoken by God’s own terrible voice, amid scenes of the most awful grandeur, and which were written with his own finger in the imperishable stone, to indicate that every letter was to be as enduring as his own eternity, the fourth one reads as follows:-*SITI April 15, 1886, page 232.10*

“Remember the Sabbath day [literally, *the day of the Sabbath*], to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work; but *the seventh day is the Sabbath* of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy manservant, nor thy maidservant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates; for in six days *the Lord* made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and *rested the seventh day*; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it.”*SITI April 15, 1886, page 232.11*

What do you say, frieend? Is the keeping of the seventh day a capricious notion, a whim? If so, do you know of any thing that is reasonable, and which rests on a solid foundation? Read the book of Malachi, and see what the prophet says of those who say, “It is vain to serve God.” E. J. W.*SITI April 15, 1886, page 232.12*

April 22, 1886

“The Handwriting of Ordinances” The Signs of the Times, 12, 16.

E. J. Waggoner

“And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses; blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross; and having spoiled principalities and powers, he made a show of them openly, triumphing over them in it. Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a holyday, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days; which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ.” *Colossians 2:13-17*. *SITI April 22, 1886, page 247.1*

The text, like *Ephesians 2:15, 16*, is often misapplied; it cannot, however, be applied to those things contained in the ten commandments, unless the texts which show the enduring nature of that law are either forgotten or ignored. The ten commandments were graven on tables of stone, by the finger of God. See *Exodus 32:15, 16; Deuteronomy 4:12, 13*. Now the Bible is a consistent book, and has respect to the fitness of things; but it is evident enough that there would be no fitness in speaking of “blotting out” something that was chiseled in the rock. Neither is it an appropriate figure to speak of nailing tables of stone to a cross. Therefore even if the Bible did not assure us that the commandments of God “stand fast forever and ever,” we should know that the apostle has in this text no reference whatever to the law of God. The things which God gave through Moses were written in a book, and only in a book; consequently it is perfectly appropriate to speak of blotting them out. If it be objected that the ten commandments were also written by Moses in a book, we reply that that makes no difference; since the ten commandments were engraved in stone, they could not be blotted out even though all the books in the world were destroyed. *SITI April 22, 1886, page 247.2*

The fact that the thing here spoken of came to an end by the cross of Christ, should cause us to conclude that the same thing is here

spoken of that is spoken of in *Ephesians 2:15, 16* as having been abolished “in his flesh.” In this text it is said to have been “contrary;” in the other it is called “enmity;” and Peter called it a burdensome yoke. This, Paul says, was “against us.” But the law of God is holy, and just, and good in its requirements. We conclude, therefore, that the “handwriting of ordinances,” which was nailed to the cross of Christ, was the Levitical law. The ceremonies were typical of the sacrifice of Christ, and when that sacrifice was actually made on the cross, the types at the same time ceased. *SITI April 22, 1886, page 247.3*

We notice that because these ordinances have been blotted out, therefore we are not to be judged concerning certain things. This indicates that those things were part of the ordinances. Paul enumerates them as meats and drinks, feast days, new moons, and sabbaths; “which are a shadow of things to come.” The very enumeration of these things shows us that the law of God is not here under discussion, for none of these things formed a part of it. It is true that the fourth commandment is concerning the Sabbath; but the Sabbath of the fourth commandment dates from creation (compare *Exodus 20:8-11; Genesis 2:2, 3*), before the fall of man made the coming of Christ a necessity; while the sabbaths mentioned in Colossians were shadows of things in the work of Christ. These sabbaths are given in *Levi. 23*, in the ceremonial law. They occurred only once a year, and were the first and seventh days of unleavened bread (*Leviticus 23:5-8*); the day of Pentecost (*verses 15-21*); the first day of the seventh month, being the memorial of blowing of trumpets (*verses 24, 25*); the tenth day of the seventh month, or the day of atonement (*verses 27-32*); and the first and eighth days of the feast of tabernacles. *Verses 34-36. SITI April 22, 1886, page 247.4*

All these days, as is seen at once in the case of the passover and the day of atonement, were feast days typifying certain parts of Christ’s mediatorial work for sinners. Of them the Lord said: “These are the feasts of the Lord, which ye shall proclaim to be holy convocations, to offer an offering made by fire unto the Lord a burnt offering, and a meat offering, a sacrifice, and drink offerings, everything upon his day.” *Leviticus 23:37*. Notice: The Lord said to Moses, “These are the feast days... which ye shall proclaim to be

holy convocations.” These are some of the things which God gave by the hand of Moses (*Nehemiah 9:14*); but the Sabbath of the fourth commandment was proclaimed by God’s own voice. This distinction is plainly marked, for after enumerating the ceremonial sabbaths which were to be observed by the people, the Lord added: “Beside the Sabbaths of the Lord.” *Leviticus 23:38*. This shows beyond all question that the sabbaths which ceased when the “handwriting of ordinances” was blotted out, were the ceremonial sabbaths, and consequently that it was not the moral law, but the ceremonial law, which constituted that “handwriting of ordinances.” *SITI April 22, 1886, page 247.5*

In addition to these proofs, it may not be amiss to cite the following statements of learned commentators, to show that the same proofs were conclusive to their minds also. Says Dr. Clark:-*SITI April 22, 1886, page 247.6*

“The apostle speaks here in reference to some particulars of the handwriting of ordinances, which had been taken away, viz., the distinction of meats and drinks, what was clean and what unclean, according to the law; and the necessity of observing certain holy days or festivals, such as the new moons and particular sabbaths, or those which should be observed with more than ordinary solemnity.... There is no intimation here that the Sabbath was done away, or that its moral use was suspended, by the introduction of Christianity. I have shown elsewhere that, ‘Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy,’ is a command of perpetual obligation.” *SITI April 22, 1886, page 247.7*

Dr. Barnes also says on the same point:-*SITI April 22, 1886, page 247.8*

“There is no evidence, from this passage, that he would teach that there was no obligation to observe any holy time, for there is not the slightest reason to believe that he meant to declare that one of the ten commandments had ceased to be binding on mankind. If he had used the word in the singular number-‘the Sabbath,’ it would then, of course, have been clear that he meant to affirm that that commandment ceased to be binding, and that a Sabbath was no longer to be observed. But the use of the term in the plural number,

and the connection, show that he had his eye on the great number of days which were observed by the Hebrews as festivals, as a part of their ceremonial and typical law, and not on the moral law, or the ten commandments. No part of the moral law, no one of the ten commandments, could be spoken of as 'a shadow of things to come.' These commandments are, from the nature of moral law, of perpetual and universal obligation." *SITI April 22, 1886, page 247.9*

A few words now concerning the different relations which the people sustained toward the moral law and toward the ceremonial law. The moral law was of primary obligation, and it was binding upon all men alike. The Gentile as well as the Jew was under obligation to worship God, to keep his Sabbath, and to abstain from murder, adultery, and theft. It was the moral law which convicted men of sin (*Romans 7:7*), and which showed all the world to be guilty before God. *Romans 3:9. SITI April 22, 1886, page 247.10*

The ceremonial law, on the other hand, was not of primary obligation. Having reference only to the mediatorial work of Christ, it had no existence before man fell. Moreover it was not of universal obligation. It would have been thought sacrilegious for an uncircumcised person, an idolator, or an atheist, to attempt to engage in the Jewish ceremonies. Yet whenever a Gentile accepted the true religion, he was, through circumcision, admitted on an equal footing with the Jew. Where, then, in individual experience, did the ceremonial law come in? Read what Paul says of Abraham, in this connection:-*SITI April 22, 1886, page 247.11*

"We say that faith was reckoned to Abraham for righteousness. How was it then reckoned? when he was in circumcision, or in uncircumcision? Not in circumcision, but in uncircumcision. And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised." *Romans 4:9-11. SITI April 22, 1886, page 248.1*

From this we learn, what none will deny, that circumcision and its kindred ceremonies, while they pointed forward to the real work of Christ, did not precede faith in Christ. They were the means by which the people signified that faith which was necessary before they could participate in them. To the man who had never heard of

Christ, those ceremonies were meaningless; but to the one who had faith in Christ and his promised work for man, they were a beautiful means of expressing that faith.*SITI April 22, 1886, page 248.2*

The moral law, being of primary and universal obligation, would be impressed by the Holy Spirit on the heart of a heathen. By it he would see himself to be a sinner. Earnestly seeking freedom from condemnation, he would find that the Messiah for whose coming the pious Jews looked with longing hearts, was the only one who could take away his sin. Joyfully seizing upon this hope, he would separate himself from his heathen associates; by circumcision he would signify the putting off of his own sinful habits; and henceforth, so long as he retained his faith in Christ, he would gladly manifest that faith, and with each manifestation thereof quicken it into renewed activity, by celebrating the ordinances which prefigured the promised sacrifice and atonement of Christ.*SITI April 22, 1886, page 248.3*

But when the reality came, the types ceased. Not so the moral law, the ten commandments of God. Being the foundation of God's Government, there was nothing in them of a fleeting or shadowy nature. They still remain of primary, universal, and eternal obligation. They still convict of sin; and he who by them is convinced of his need of One who can save from sin, may still come to a Saviour who has suffered for sin, and may obtain pardon. Through the ordinances of the Lord's house,-baptism and the Lord's Supper,-he may show his faith in a sacrifice already made, until his promised redemption is consummated by the return of his Lord; and then from Sabbath to Sabbath he may worship before the Lord, and see his face; and the law, which stands fast forever and ever, will witness to his loyalty to the Creator. E. J. W.*SITI April 22, 1886, page 248.4*

May 6, 1886

“Under the Law” The Signs of the Times, 12, 17.

E. J. Waggoner

One of the peculiarities of the human mind is that while it readily grasps a pleasing story or a fable, it refuses to accept truth until it is compelled to. So strong is this tendency toward error, that mental philosophers are obliged to take it into account. One of Bacon’s rules for avoiding erroneous conclusions is the following: “In general, let the student of nature take this as a rule, that whatever the mind seizes and dwells upon with particular satisfaction is to be held in suspicion.” The converse would teach that truth will naturally be repelled and rejected. And this is just what the Bible says: “The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God.” *1 Corinthians 2:14*. “The carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be.” *Romans 8:7*. “For out of the heart proceed naturally evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, blasphemies.” *Matthew 15:19*. These things are directly opposed to the law of God; and therefore, as a general thing, before men will accept the truth of the Bible concerning the law, every feature must be made perfectly clear. It is not enough that the principles be unfolded, but the harmony of all the texts bearing on the subject must be shown. *SITI May 6, 1886, page 263.1*

Accordingly we find it necessary to devote special explanation to *Romans 6:14* and kindred texts. That text reads thus: “For sin shall not have dominion over you; for ye are not under the law, but under grace.” So strong is the natural tendency to reject truth, that in spite of the overwhelming evidence already produced to show that the law is to all eternity binding upon every created rational being, many people will seize upon the expression, “Ye are not under the law,” and claim that there are some, at least, who have no duty to keep it. The readiness with which this view is seized and dwelt upon, should alone arouse suspicion as to its justice. But that there may be no chance for an honest doubt, we propose to examine not only this text, but every text which contains the phrase, “under the law.” *SITI May 6, 1886, page 263.2*

In *Romans 6:12* the apostle gives this exhortation: "Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey it in the lusts thereof." We have already learned that "sin is the transgression of the law." *1 John 3:4*. Therefore when the apostle tells us not to sin, he virtually tells us not to transgress the law. But this is an evidence that the law is binding upon us; and therefore we are assured that the statement in *verse 14* cannot mean that the law has no claims upon us. *SITI May 6, 1886, page 263.3*

Again: The apostle continues: "Neither yield ye your members as instruments of unrighteousness unto sin; but yield yourselves unto God, as those that are alive from the dead, and your members as instruments of righteousness unto God." *Romans 6:13*. This is but a repetition of the argument presented in the preceding paragraph. For he says we must not sin, that is, must not transgress the law; and again, that we must yield our members as instruments of righteousness. Now righteousness is obedience to the commandments of God. See *Deuteronomy 6:25; Psalm 119:172; Isaiah 51:6, 7*, which have already been explained. So the *13th verse* is an exhortation not to transgress the law, and another exhortation to keep the law, both of which amount to the same thing, and show that the apostle recognizes the fact that the law is in existence and is to be obeyed. *SITI May 6, 1886, page 263.4*

Then comes the conclusion: "For sin shall not have dominion over you; for ye are not under the law, but under grace." *Verse 14*. Notice a few facts and necessary conclusions. 1. Since "sin is the transgression of the law," the absence of sin must indicate obedience to the law. Therefore when the apostle says to any persons, "Sin shall not have dominion over you," it is an evidence that they are keeping the law. 2. Those over whom sin has no dominion are those who are not under the law. "Sin shall not have dominion over you; *for* ye are not under the law." The fact that sin has no dominion over them is *an evidence* that they are "not under the law." Therefore, to be "*not* under the law" is equivalent to being free from the dominion of sin. 2. But we have already seen that to be free from the dominion of sin represents a state of obedience to the law; therefore, to say that one is "*not* under the law" is equivalent to saying that he is keeping the law. *SITI May 6, 1886, page 263.5*

These propositions will stand the test of any criticism, and they demonstrate that the apostle's argument is based on the fact that the law is in full force, binding upon all, and that there are but two classes of people; those who keep the law, and those who transgress it. Those who keep the law are *not* under it, and of course those who transgress it *are* under it. In other words, those over whom sin has dominion are under the law; and those over whom sin has not dominion, are *not* under the law. *SITI May 6, 1886, page 263.6*

In harmony with this, the apostle continued "When then? Shall we sin, because we are not under the law, but under grace? God forbid." *Verse 15*. That is, Shall we transgress the law because we are not under it? By no means. Keep from under it, by refraining from sin. *SITI May 6, 1886, page 263.7*

Thus far we have not shown the full force of the terms "under the law," and "not under the law," but have simply shown that they do not indicate that any persons are outside the jurisdiction of the law; that those "under the law" are violating it, while those "*not* under the law" are obeying it. The next two verses give us a clew to the real force of the terms. They read thus: "Know ye not, that to whom ye yield yourselves servants to obey, his servants ye are to whom ye obey; whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness? But God be thanked, that ye were the servants of sin, but ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you." *Verses 16, 17*. "Whether of sin unto death, or of obedience unto righteousness." Sin, the transgression of the law, brings death. "For the wages of sin is death." *Romans 6:23*. Every one who sins is under condemnation of death; and since, as has been abundantly proved, those who sin are "under the law," it follows that "under the law" is an expression meaning, Under the condemnation of the law. Now see how aptly this meaning fits *verses 14 and 15*. Ye are not under the condemnation of the law, but under the grace of God. Shall we sin, then, because we are not by the law condemned to death? No, indeed; for that would at once bring us again under condemnation. Let us keep from sinning, and then we shall be no more condemned. How are we freed from the condemnation which the law brings? "Being justified freely by his [God's] grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus; whom

God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the commission of sins that are past.” *Romans 3:24, 25*. Having accepted Christ, his righteousness is imputed to us, which makes us clear before the law, and we are then subjects of the grace, or forbearance of God.*SITI May 6, 1886, page 263.8*

Take an illustration from human affairs. Here is a man that has been convicted of murder. The law of the State forbids murder, and therefore it condemns the man. The murderer is then “under the law,” because the hand of the law is upon him. Nothing that he can do will avert the threatened punishment. He may be sorry for his crime, and may resolve never to break the law again; but that will make no difference. He has already broken the law, and must suffer the penalty. But now, through the intercession of powerful friends, and because of his repentance and his promises of future obedience, the Governor is induced to pardon the criminal. Now he is no longer under the law,-a condemned prisoner,-but a free man. He is free by virtue of the grace or favor of the Governor. Therefore he may be said to be “under grace.” The question now arises. Is he at liberty to commit murder, because he is not under the law, but under the grace of the Governor? Everybody says, No, indeed. He is now under even greater obligation to keep the law than he was before, because he is the subject of the Governor’s special favor; and that favor would not have been extended to him, but for his promise to henceforth keep the law.*SITI May 6, 1886, page 263.9*

And as sin brought condemnation and death, so, when we are cleared from sin and condemnation, continued obedience, or righteousness, brings eternal life through Christ. This is indicated by the expression, servants “of obedience unto righteousness” (*Romans 6:16*) and, “the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord.” *Romans 6:23*.*SITI May 6, 1886, page 264.1*

In closing this preliminary study of the term, “under the law,” the reader can profitably compare with what he has read, the following verses:-*SITI May 6, 1886, page 264.2*

“Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift

came upon all men unto justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous. Moreover the law entered, that the offence might abound. But where sin abounded, grace did much more abound; that as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life by Jesus Christ our Lord." *Romans 5:18-21*. E. J. W. *SITI* May 6, 1886, page 264.3

May 13, 1886

“Logical Antinomianism” The Signs of the Times, 12, 18.

E. J. Waggoner

A writer for a professedly Adventist paper in the East, in an article against Sabbath-keeping, says of the ten commandments: “Paul tells those who keep this law that they are ‘fallen from grace,’ which is equivalent to saying that there is no salvation in keeping the ten commandments.” We never yet came across any such statement in any of Paul’s writings, but we know that there are many people who, in their hatred of the Sabbath, teach just such stuff. There are people organized into churches, whose chief article of faith is that the law of God is abolished, although it is seldom that one is found bold enough to declare that all who keep the law of God are worthy of death. But this is the inevitable conclusion; for if God’s law has been abolished, then it must now be sin to follow the injunctions of that law. *SITI May 13, 1886, page 278.1*

Let us suppose that we have the records of a church whose foundation (?) is the belief that God’s law has been abolished, in which discipline is rigidly enforced. We should read something like this: “Brother A was charged with a crime of not having taken the name of God in vain for three months. A committee was appointed to labor with him, but he acknowledged the truth of the charge, and stubbornly refused to change his course, stating that he was determined always to hold the name of his Creator in reverence. Accordingly he was disfellowshipped as one irrevocably fallen from grace. *SITI May 13, 1886, page 278.2*

“Deacon B had in early life been well known as a horse jockey. After he joined the church his natural ability was exerted with tenfold diligence for the edifying of the body of Christ. So skillful had he become by long practice in chicanery, that no man could by any means get even with him in a bargain. He could cheat and lie with unblushing countenance. In short, he was an ornament to the church. But in an evil day he fell in with a traveling preacher, who persuaded him that the law of God is binding upon Christians, and from that time he became a different man. He began at once to

restore to those whom he had defrauded. This caused suspicion in the minds of his brethren. Finally suspicion became certainty, when Brother X overheard him tell the truth in regard to an old horse which he was selling to one he was no judge of animals. By this unwarranted act, he actually lost the opportunity of cheating the poor man out of fifty dollars! In another instance, he could easily have extorted one hundred per cent interest from a brother who was forced to borrow a sum of money for three months. Instead of doing so, however, he loaned the brother the money without interest. Patient labor was bestowed upon him, but to all entreaties he turned a deaf ear, perversely repeating the words, Thou shalt not steal, and saying that henceforth he should abide by that rule. He even expressed extreme sorrow that he ever violated it. He was decided to be an incorrigible observer of the old ten-commandment law, and was accordingly disfellowshipped by unanimous vote. *SITI May 13, 1886, page 278.3*

“Mr. C had gained a wide notoriety as a ‘bruiser’ and cut-throat. He had ‘killed his man’ many times, and was so expert with the pistol that his bullet never failed to reach the heart. It was his delight to lie in wait for unsuspecting and inoffensive persons, and kill them without any warning. He was so adroit with all, that the officers of the law had never been able to detect him in these acts. He had never read the Bible, nor heard of the ten commandments. He was finally arrested for a petty crime, and while lying in jail he was visited by a clergyman, who read the Bible to him. For the first time in his life he heard the obsolete commandment, Thou shalt not kill. When he learned that this was spoken by the great Jehovah, amid the thunders of Sinai, he was struck with terror and remorse, with trembling lips he confessed all his past course, and was assured by the minister that God would pardon. Accordingly, as soon as he was released, he applied for admission to the church; but he was told that he had now fallen from grace, -that the ten commandments are abolished; that no man who professed a desire to keep them could become a member of the church of Belial. After a short talk with the committee, he seemed to see the matter clearly. Drawing a revolver, he shot the chairman through the heart, and with a club he knocked down two of the deacons, all the time using the most violent oaths. Upon this clear evidence of his fitness for church membership, he was at once received into full fellowship. *SITI May*

13, 1886, page 278.4

“Brother D was turned out of the church in disgrace. Cause: A rigid observance of the old seventh commandment. At the same time, Mr. F and Mrs. G. on profession of having lived in open adultery for a year, were admitted into the church.” *SITI May 13, 1886, page 278.5*

And thus we might read on for pages. Does it seem irreverent to write in such a strain? It is only what would actually be done if no-law people always lived up to their profession. People have actually been turned out of churches simply because they kept the fourth commandment; and if people are disfellowshipped for keeping the fourth commandment, why not for keeping any other? And when men say that it is sin to keep the ten commandments, who shall say what abominable things they do not do in secret? or that they would not do them openly if fear of their fellow-men did not restrain them? *SITI May 13, 1886, page 278.6*

Why is it that professed Christians speak with such contempt of the law of God? Because they hate the fourth commandment, which enjoins the observance of the Sabbath. Primarily, however, it is because of the hatred of all law and restraint. No doubt they would repudiate the picture which we have portrayed. They would profess abhorrence of murder, adultery, and theft. But if it is a sin to keep the fourth commandment, it is also wrong to keep the sixth, seventh and eighth. If they teach that the law of God is not in force, that those who keep it have fallen from grace, they necessarily teach that it is no sin to swear, lie, steal, kill, and commit adultery! Nay, more, they actually teach people that they must do those things in order to secure the favor of God! A more horrible doctrine could not be imagined. To teachers of such doctrines we commend a careful consideration of the following texts, the application of which is obvious:- *SITI May 13, 1886, page 278.7*

“Behold, ye trust in lying words, that cannot profit. Will ye steal, murder, and commit adultery, and swear falsely, and burn incense unto Baal, and walk after other gods whom ye know not; and, stand before me in this house, which is called by my name, and say, We are delivered to do all these abominations?” *Jeremiah 7:8-10.SITI*

May 13, 1886, page 278.8

“Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil; that the darkness to light, and light for darkness; that put bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter!” “Therefore as the fire devoureth the stubble, and the flame consumeth the chaff, so their root shall be as rottenness, and their blossoms shall go up as dust; because they have cast away law of the Lord of hosts, and despised the word of the Holy One of Israel.” *Isaiah 5:20, 24. W.SITI May 13, 1886, page 278.9*

“Under the Law” The Signs of the Times, 12, 18.

E. J. Waggoner

The next text which we shall notice is *Galatians 5:18*. “But if ye led of the Spirit, ye are not under the law.” Antinomians very rarely quote this verse, doubtless because it is so very evident from the connection that the law is recognized as being in active existence. Let us give it our attention for a little while, that we may see what beautiful harmony there is in the Bible on the subject of the law. *SITI May 13, 1886, page 278.10*

Since those who are led by the Spirit are not under the law, it follows that those who are not led by the Spirit are under the law. Again, the preceding verses read as follows: “This I say then, Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfill the lust of the flesh. For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh; and these are contrary the one to the other.” *Galatians 5:16, 17*. These verses state in the plainest terms that the flesh and the Spirit are contrary to each other; that walking in the flesh and walking in the Spirit are directly opposite conditions. Then since those who are led by the Spirit are not under the law, and those who are not led by the Spirit are under the law, it follows that those who are under the law are those who are fulfilling the lusts of the flesh. *SITI May 13, 1886, page 278.11*

“Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are these: Adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revelings, and such like; of the which I tell

you before, as I have also told you in time past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God.” *Galatians 5:19-21*. *SITI May 13, 1886, page 278.12*

The fruit of the Spirit is, of course, the very opposite, being “love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance.” *Verses 22, 23*. Referring to these fruits of the Spirit, the apostle says: “Against such there is no law.” *Verse 23*. That is, those who are led by the Spirit, and who yield its fruits, are in harmony with the law; while the law is against the works of the flesh; and those who do the works of the flesh are condemned by the law, or are under it. Here we arrive at the same conclusion as in regard to *Romans 6:14*, that “under the law” simply represents a state of antagonism to, and violation of, the law; and of course no one could be in such a state if the law were not in full force. Now since all sinners are by the law condemned to death (*Romans 3:19; 6:23*), it follows again that “under the law” means condemned by the law—under the sentence of death. *SITI May 13, 1886, page 278.13*

Turning backward, we find the expression “under the law” used twice in *Galatians 4:4, 5*: “But when the fullness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons.” *SITI May 13, 1886, page 278.14*

In the third verse the apostle says that when we were children we were “in bondage under the elements of the world.” But (that marks a change) God sent forth his Son to redeem “them that were under the law.” We would naturally expect the redemption to be from that under which we were in bondage, which was “the elements of the world.” In the fifth verse the redemption is said to be from “under the law,” thus showing that “in bondage under the elements of the world,” and “under the law,” are equivalent terms. *SITI May 13, 1886, page 278.15*

Let us trace further this matter of bondage. In *verse 9* Paul says to the Galatians: “But now, after that ye have known God, or rather are known of God, how turn ye again to the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto ye desire again to be in bondage?” Here it is implied that they were in danger of returning to a condition in which

they had previously been. And what condition was that? Read verse 8: "Howbeit then, when ye knew not God, ye did service unto them which by nature are no gods." That is, they were heathen. So being in bondage to the elements of the world,-the "weak and beggarly elements,"-is equivalent to being in a state of heathenism. Those who do not know God are termed heathen. But no man can know God without being a follower of Christ, as the Saviour said, "No man cometh unto the Father, but by me." *John 14:6*. In the strict Bible sense, therefore, all who are not in Christ are heathen. And therefore although Paul addressed his epistle to those who had been idolaters in the commonly accepted sense, the argument is of universal application. *SITI May 13, 1886, page 278.16*

We conclude, then, that the "elements of the world" are simply the various forms of sin. This is still further shown by *Ephesians 2:1-3*: "And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins; wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience; among whom also we all had our conversation [manner of life] in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were by nature the children of wrath, even as others." Nothing but sin is meant by "the course of this world," the "weak and beggarly elements," and "the elements of the world." And to be "in bondage under the elements of the world," is to be "under the law," in a state of condemnation. *SITI May 13, 1886, page 279.1*

Christ came in the fullness of time (see *Mark 1:14, 15; Daniel 9:25*) "to redeem them that were under the law." But in order to do this, he himself had to be "made under the law." This is in harmony with *Hebrews 2:17*, which says: "Wherefore in all things it behooved him to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make reconciliation for the sins of the people." The people whom Christ came to redeem were "under the law," therefore he was made like them, "under the law." *SITI May 13, 1886, page 279.2*

Now if there is any lingering doubt as to the meaning of "under the law," compare with the above and *Galatians 4:4, 5*, Paul's words in *2 Corinthians 5:21*: "For he [God] hath made him [Christ] to be sin

for us, who knew no sin; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him." Christ was sinless; he "did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth" (*1 Peter 2:22*); the Law of God was in his heart (*Psalms 40:8*), and his whole life was an exemplification of the law. Yet knowing no sin, he was made to be sin for us. As the prophet said: "He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all." *Isaiah 53:5, 6*. We were in bondage to sin, "under the law," and he took upon himself the same bonds, and was made under the law. Moreover, since those "under the law" are condemned, under sentence of death, he, "being found in fashion as a man," having voluntarily placed himself in the same condemnation, "became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross." *Philippians 2:7, 8*. *SITI May 13, 1886, page 279.3*

And so the innocent suffered for the guilty. Man had been overcome by sin, and by it brought into bondage (*2 Peter 2:19*), and in order to redeem him from this corruption, and the death that must necessarily follow (*James 1:15*), the spotless Son of God took upon himself the form of a servant of sin, and consented to be covered with the same degradation into which man had plunged himself. What for? "That we might be made the righteousness of God in him." *2 Corinthians 5:21*. In order that we might be made without "spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing" (*Ephesians 5:27*),—perfectly conformable to the holy Law of God; and that thus being enabled, in Christ, to keep the commandments, we might through him have eternal life. *Matthew 19:17*. *SITI May 13, 1886, page 279.4*

Before leaving this text in Galatians, there is one more point which we wish to place before the reader. We read that Christ was "made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law." It was necessary for Christ to assume the condition of those whom he would redeem. This being the case, we may know that Christ redeems none who occupy a position different from that which he took. This is plainly stated in the Scripture. "For verily he took not on him the nature of angels; but he took on him the seed of Abraham. Wherefore in all things it behooved him to be made like unto his brethren," etc. *Hebrews 2:16, 17*. Those whom he was made like,

he can redeem; others he cannot. We read also that Christ “died for all.” *2 Corinthians 5:15*. What, then, is the necessary conclusion? Just this: Since he was made “under the law,” and was made like those whom he came to redeem, and he came to redeem all men, then all men were “under the law.” Further, the text indicates that he came for the sole purpose of redeeming them that were under the law; their being under the law made necessary some act for their redemption. If they had not been under the law, they would have needed no redemption. Now when we recall Paul’s words to the effect that Christ “gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works” (*Titus 2:14*), the conclusion is unavoidable that “under the law” indicates the state of sin which characterizes every human being, and from which none can be rescued but by Christ. *SITI May 13, 1886, page 279.5*

But notice the dilemma in which they place themselves, who claim that Gentiles are not “under the law,” and that the law was only for the Jews. If that position were true, it would necessarily follow that since Christ came to redeem only those who are under the law, he came to redeem only the Jews! For certain it is, that no person who is not in the position which Christ took upon himself when he came to redeem man, can have any part in that redemption. We think that none, when they consider this point, will place themselves outside of God’s scheme of redemption, by refusing to admit that they are by nature and by practice “under the law.” *SITI May 13, 1886, page 279.6*

Let us rather acknowledge our guilt, that it may be washed away in the blood of the Lamb. “He that covereth his sins shall not prosper; but whoso confesseth and forsaketh them shall have mercy.” *Proverbs 28:13. W. SITI May 13, 1886, page 279.7*

“Cleansing of the Sanctuary” The Signs of the Times, 12, 18.

E. J. Waggoner

QUESTION.-“Was the cleansing of the sanctuary finished at the end of the twenty-three hundred days? or is the work of cleansing still going on? If it is still going on, when will it be finished? “W. L.

K."SITI May 13, 1886, page 279.8

ANSWER.-It is very evident from the reading of *Daniel 8:13, 14* that the end of the twenty-three hundred (years), the cleansing of the sanctuary was begun, and not then finished. The angels words, "Unto two thousand and three hundred years; then shall the sanctuary cleansed," were in reply to the following questions: "How long shall be the vision concerning the daily, and the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the post to be trodden underfoot?" The reply showed that the sanctuary and the host were to be *trodden underfoot* "unto two thousand and three hundred days;" consequently the cleansing *began* at the close of the days.*SITI May 13, 1886, page 279.9*

The cleansing of the sanctuary is the blotting out of the sins of God's people. When that work is finished, the names of those who have not overcome will have been blotted out of the Lamb's book of life, and that shows that probation ends when the work of cleansing the sanctuary is completed. But the gospel still reaches the hearts of sinners; therefore probation is not ended, and the work of cleansing the sanctuary is still going on. When this work will be finished, no man can tell. We cannot know that it will be soon. To the close of this work the following words apply: "Be ye therefore ready also; for the Son of man cometh at an hour when ye think not."*SITI May 13, 1886, page 279.10*

May 20, 1886

“Dr. Munhall on the Sabbath” The Signs of the Times, 12, 19.

E. J. Waggoner

We had the pleasure one day last week of listening to a “Bible-reading” on the Sabbath question, given by Dr. L. Munhall, the evangelist who has been holding revival services in San Francisco for several weeks. It was advertised to be a Bible-reading, but was, in fact, a short sermon, with a few more Scripture quotations that are usually heard in the popular modern sermon. The “reading,” however, was more pointed and interesting than any other Sabbath study we ever heard from a first-day preacher. *SITI May 20, 1886, page 294.1*

The Doctor began by saying that the law of the Sabbath was given long before Mount Sinai. He quoted *Exodus 16:25, 26*: “And Moses said, Eat that to-day; for to-day is a Sabbath unto the Lord; to-day ye shall not find it in the field. Six days ye shall gather it; but on the seventh day, which is the Sabbath, in it there shall be none.” “These words,” said the speaker, “indicate that the Sabbath was not first given at Sinai, but was kept before. The law of the Sabbath is as old as creation. The Fourth Commandment found in *Exodus 20:8-11*, connects itself with what was said at the first, recorded in *Genesis 2:1-3*, and makes good the law that obtained among God’s people even before the thunders of Sinai. The Sabbath was the seventh day of creation.” *SITI May 20, 1886, page 294.2*

In the above paragraph we have given the exact expressions of Mr. Munhall. No one could have made a better statement on the case, for it is the exact truth. The speaker then read the following texts: *SITI May 20, 1886, page 294.3*

“Six days thou shalt work, but on the seventh day thou shalt rest: in earing [plowing] time and in harvest thou shalt rest.” *Exodus 34:21. SITI May 20, 1886, page 294.4*

“Six days shall work be done, but on the seventh day there shall be to you an holy day, a Sabbath of rest to the Lord; whosoever doeth

work therein shall be put to death.” *Exodus 35:2.SITI May 20, 1886, page 294.5*

“These,” said Mr. Munhall, “are explicit statements with reference to the Sabbath law. We are to cease on the Sabbath from our usual daily employments. The Sabbath is to be a day of rest. It is not to be spent in idleness, sleeping half the forenoon, eating a big dinner, and taking a buggy ride in the afternoon. Rest don’t mean idleness. But the Sabbath is to be spent in work for God, because it was hallowed by him.” *SITI May 20, 1886, page 294.6*

The Doctor then read *Nehemiah 10:31; 13:15*, as another point on the way the Sabbaths should be kept. They read thus: “And if the people of the land bring ware or any victuals on the Sabbath day to sell, that we would not buy it of them on the Sabbath, or on the holy day; and that we would leave the seventh year, and the exaction of every debt.” “In those days saw I in Judah some treading wine presses on the Sabbath, and bringing in sheaves, and lading asses; as also wine, grapes, and figs, and all manner of burdens, which they brought into Jerusalem on the Sabbath day; and I testified against them in the day wherein they sold victuals.” *SITI May 20, 1886, page 294.7*

On these texts the following strange comments were made: “This touches a point that needs to be noted by Christian people. Some of you will send your children to market on Sunday morning for meat. Or you will step into a cigar store, or stop and get a glass of soda on your way home from church on Sunday. But you will say, ‘Suppose I should forget to get my beefsteak on Saturday night; but not be necessary to get it on Sunday morning?’ You have no business to forget. If you do forget, you must go without. Every desire of a heart and stomach is not to be gratified at the expense of God’s law. If your grain will spoil if you don’t work on Sunday, then lose your grain. If you are a produce dealer, and your provisions will spoil if you don’t work on Sunday, then use your provisions. Obey God.” *SITI May 20, 1886, page 294.8*

To the last sentence in the above paragraph we can hardly subscribe. So we could to all the rest, if the speaker had used the word Sabbath instead of Sunday. He had previously said that the

seventh day was set apart at creation, and that was kept by the people of God before the commandment for its observance was given upon Mount Sinai. Of course the seventh day must have been kept by God's people after the specific law for its observance had been given amid the thunders of Sinai; and this is allowed by Mr. Munhall, for later in his discourse he said that no day but the seventh day is the Sabbath. How then can he learn from *Exodus 34:21; 35:2; Nehemiah 10:31, and 13:15* how Sunday should be kept? We agreed that the things of which he speaks ought not to be done on the *Sabbath*, because God has forbidden them. "Obey God," says Mr. Munhall. So we say; and therefore we refrain from labor on the seventh day of the week, as God has commanded. But how can a man obey God by doing something which God never commanded? Impossible. Mr. Munhall exhorts the people to obey God by refraining from labor on Sunday, and in the same discourse tells them that "there is no 'Thus saith the Lord' for the observe of Sunday," and that "the Sabbath has never been transferred from the seventh to the first day." *SITI May 20, 1886, page 294.9*

But a still more wonderful exposition followed. The Doctor said: "I may be called a Puritan, because of my rigid observance of Sunday. Very well, I am willing. There are specific reasons in God's word why this they should be kept. *Exodus 20*: He says: 'In six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it.' God has hallowed this day. Because he has hallowed it, we must keep it holy." *SITI May 20, 1886, page 294.10*

God has hallowed the seventh day, and therefore we must keep the first day holy! If the Doctor had designed to give us an example of a *non sequitur*, he could not have done better. Yet he was in sober earnest. God commands us to do a certain thing, and we obey him by doing something directly contrary! People never reason that way in regard to the laws of men. *SITI May 20, 1886, page 294.11*

Ezekiel 20:12: "Moreover all so I gave them my Sabbaths, to be a sign between me and them, that they may know that I am the Lord that sanctify them." On this text, the Doctor made the following true statement: "Unless we observe the Sabbath as God has directed,

we shall forget God. There was never a nation that ignored the Sabbath that did not forget God. France is an example, and the same thing is coming upon this country. [The speaker then quoted *Exodus 31:15, 16*; *Nehemiah 13:18*; and *Ezekiel 20:20, 21*.] These also have direct reference to God's ancient people, and to the troubles that came upon them because they violated the Sabbath. Their land was filled with mourning. The Sabbath was made for men (*Mark 2:27*), for the welfare of society. The violation of the Sabbath always brings trouble. Look at the riots in Chicago, St. Louis, and Cincinnati. In the cities the Sabbath is almost universally trampled under foot. There will also be riot and bloodshed in San Francisco if the Sabbath is not observed better. Show me a city where there is riot and bloodshed, and I will show you one where the Sabbath is disregarded." *SITI May 20, 1886, page 294.12*

It is true if that the violation of the Sabbath is always accompanied by forgetfulness of God. If all people kept the Sabbath, there would be no heathenism, and prosperity might be expected. But Sabbath-keeping is not a national, but an individual affair. That is, a nation, in its national capacity, cannot keep the Sabbath. A nation can be said to keep the Sabbath only when all the individuals composing a nation are Sabbath keepers. And when any considerable number of people in a nation do not observe the Sabbath, any number of legislative acts in favor of Sabbath-keeping will not make that nation a Sabbath-keeping nation. The same is true with regard to any other which God requires. *SITI May 20, 1886, page 294.13*

But it is the keeping of *the Sabbath* that makes people know the true God. Now Doctor Munhall himself declares that the seventh day, and that only, is the Sabbath. It alone was rested upon by the Creator; the seventh day alone was blessed by him; and the seventh day, and no other, was by the Creator appointed to be kept holy. No other day could be *kept* holy, because no other day was ever *made* holy. How then is it possible for Dr. Munhall, while acknowledging all these facts, to say that the disregard of Sunday is responsible for the prevailing godlessness? Further: Since the keeping of the Sabbath is the only evidence given to indicate that people know God, must we not conclude that the keeping of the day which is not the Sabbath, and the consequent profanation of the only day which God ever appointed as the Sabbath, is evidence

that people have largely forgotten God? It cannot be otherwise. And when a nation goes so far as to enjoin the observance of Sunday, then we may know that God is practically ignored. And still further: When we find legislators and ministers of the gospel combining to enact laws devoting the Sabbath of God's appointment to pleasure, in order that men may rest on Sunday, concerning which God has said nothing except to command us to work upon it, we have overwhelming evidence that men are not only ignoring God, but that they have so forgotten him that they can heap insult upon him without the slightest fear of his power. "For which things' sake the wrath of God cometh on the children of disobedience." Most true it is that terrible judgments are coming upon this land because of the insults which the people have offered to the one great Lawgiver; and we cannot help trembling for the fate of men who use their influence as ministers of the gospel to induce people to disregard the true Sabbath of the Lord for a day which they acknowledge has no "Thus saith the Lord" in its behalf. *W.SITI May 20, 1886, page 294.14*

(Concluded next week.)

"The Bible vs. Mythology" The Signs of the Times, 12, 19.

E. J. Waggoner

Among Christian people of modern times nothing is more common than to speak of death as a river. It is spoken of as "the dark river," "death's river," "the dismal flood," etc. people have died are said to have "crossed the river," or "passed over to the other side." Of course these terms can be used only by those who believe the paradox at death men still continue to live. They believe that death is but the entrance to life, and therefore they sing, "Death is the gate to endless joy," and, "'Tis but the voice that Jesus sends to call us to his arms." In harmony with this idea, also, they sing, "Shall we meet beyond the river?" meaning, shall we meet after death? *SITI May 20, 1886, page 294.15*

Now every Bible student ought to know that these expressions are entirely unscriptural. Death is not the gate to endless joy, but an enemy. See *1 Corinthians 15:26*. It is not the voice that Jesus

sends to call us to his arms, but something that is under the control of the devil. *Hebrews 2:14*. Christ gained the power and the right to call his children to his arms only by gaining the victory over death. *Hebrews 2:14, 15; Revelation 3:18*. Death is not a river across which the righteous are ferried to the realms of bliss, but a voracious monster by which they are held until the last trump releases them from its cruel grasp. *1 Thessalonians 4:16; 1 Corinthians 15:51, 52; Hosea 13:14*. And then this last enemy shall be destroyed. Nowhere in the Bible is death likened to a river. *SITI May 20, 1886, page 294.16*

Whence then did these expressions arise. Some, no doubt, think that the figure comes from the Israelites crossing the river Jordan into the land of Canaan. But that is a mistaken idea. 1. Although the entering of the Israelites into Canaan was a type of the entering of the saints into their final inheritance, we have seen that death is not the gate to that inheritance, and that some will receive their inheritance without seeing death. See *1 Corinthians 15:51, 52; 1 Thessalonians 4:15-17*. Therefore the river Jordan cannot be a type of death. 2. Even if it were a type of death, the popular idea would not hold, because the river was cut off, so that the Israelites went over dry shod. 3. There was no change whatever of the condition of the Israelites after they crossed the river. The entire absence of any Bible comparison of death to a river, and the fact that death is emphatically stated to be an enemy, and that it is not in any sense the boundary of our eternal inheritance, show that the popular expressions for death have no Bible foundation. *SITI May 20, 1886, page 295.1*

If we study heathen mythology, however we find the origin of these terms. Among the heathen, the river Styx encircled the abode of the dead. In order to get to this abode, the departed had to be towed over the Styx in a ferry managed by Charon who, demanded an *obelus*, about three cents, as his fee. To provide the soul with the necessary means to defray his expenses to *hades*, an *obelus* was always placed in the mouth of the dead person. From this heathen custom arose the modern practice of calling death a river, and of speaking of the dead as having passed to the other shore, or as having been watted over the river. *SITI May 20, 1886, page 295.2*

Now we have no objection to this. Indeed, we think that it is eminently fitting that those who hold to the heathen doctrine of natural immortality should use heathen terms in speaking of it. Nevertheless, the users of such language sometimes get mixed in their metaphors, as is evident from the following extract from a communication written by Dr. William Dean to the *Watchman*:-*SITI May 20, 1886, page 295.3*

“Yesterday I stood on the banks of the dark river to help a young man of twenty-nine years, a New York broker, into the ferry-boat to take him over to the other side. As he was moving out, his young wife stretched out her arms and caught him, exclaiming, in her anguish, ‘-, don’t go! I cannot let you go. If you must go, take me with you.’ This departure reminded me that I was sent to cross the same river, and gave rise to a train a serious reflections.”*SITI May 20, 1886, page 295.4*

The mixture of the literal and the figurative in the above paragraph is amusing. For instance, are we to suppose that the Doctor was himself at the point of death? That is what is usually meant when a person is said to be standing on the brink of “the dark river.”*SITI May 20, 1886, page 295.5*

Again, when the Doctor says that he was helping the young man into the ferry-boat which was to bear him over the river, are we to understand that he was trying to hasten the young man’s death? We have never heard it claimed by even the most enthusiastic believer in the doctrine that “death is the gate to endless joy,” that it is allowable to kill a good man in order to get into heaven sooner. The Doctor’s conduct ought to be inquired into.*SITI May 20, 1886, page 295.6*

But the next sentence is more wonderful still: “As he was moving off, his young wife stretched out her arms and caught him, explaining in her anguish, ‘—don’t go! I cannot let you go!’” How was this? Was the young man about to cross the river bodily? We never supposed that Charon’s craft was staunch enough to carry anything more substantial than an immaterial spirit. The language would indicate that his body was about to make the attempt to accompany the spirit to the “other side.” Or are we to infer that the

young wife caught her husband's immaterial spirit in her arms? If so, it was a remarkable case of materialization. We hope that in a future letter the Doctor will give us more of the details of this affair. He ought at least to tell us plainly whether he killed the young man or not.*SITI May 20, 1886, page 295.7*

The only moral which we shall draw from this narrative is that professed Christians ought not to mix their faith with heathen doctrines and mythological expressions. Leave such things to the unenlightened heathen, but let Christians follow the doctrines and use the language of the Bible. W.*SITI May 20, 1886, page 295.8*

“The Church and Boycotting” The Signs of the Times, 12, 19.

E. J. Waggoner

The Fresno *Democrat* thinks that Judge Sawyer's decision that boycotting is conspiracy, is not just, and says:-*SITI May 20, 1886, page 296.1*

“A peaceful boycott against them [the Chinese] and those who employ them was commanded by the Sacramento Convention. This is clearly lawful, and even were it not, no number of statutes could prevent it. If this style of boycott is declared against the laws, where will the matter end? Church organizations may be prosecuted for declaring war against theaters, dancing-halls, and the like, and temperance organizations may be held to answer for putting the whiskey-shops under their ban. Such strange construction of law would lead us into foolish and dangerous straits.”*SITI May 20, 1886, page 296.2*

The above simply shows how terribly muddled political journals are apt to become when they attempt to enunciate principles of religion. Boycotting the Chinaman, who has as much right to protection from this country as any other person has, and boycotting those who refuse to boycott the Chinese, is no more to be compared with the opposition of the church to theaters, saloons, etc. than Herr Most's incendiary speeches are to the preaching of the gospel.*SITI May 20, 1886, page 296.3*

Any man, or any number of men, may decline to deal with any other person or number of persons. No one has a right to compel them to trade where they do wish to; but by the same rule they have no right to try to compel others not to trade where they may wish to. This last is just what boycotting is; and any candid man must admit that it is not straining a point in the least to say that for a number of men to combine to rule on another's business is conspiracy. *SITI May 20, 1886, page 296.4*

The opposition of the church and the temperance society to theaters, saloons, etc., has no such characteristics. Christians are by their profession pledged to abstain from all evil; and knowing that theaters and saloons are only evil in their nature, they shun such places. They also endeavor to induce others to shun evil places and associates. But no Christian boycotts either the saloon-keeper or his victim. One who follows the teachings of Christ will be as ready to assist a saloon-keeper if he is in distress as he will one who is in a respectable business; and while rendering this assistance, the Christian will try to turn a man from the evil of his ways. Much less does the Christian refuse all intercourse with the man who may patronize the theater or the saloon. His very profession requires him to "do good unto all men;" and the Master has set the example of kindness to the erring. Therefore when a man compares the work of the church with that of boycotting leagues, he shows that he has no knowledge whatever of Christianity. *SITI May 20, 1886, page 296.5*

We have said that no Christian boycotts either the saloon or the theater. Much less will a Christian boycott one who is pursuing a legitimate business, and is doing no injury to anyone. But we are compelled to admit that many people who profess Christianity, and whose names are on some church roll, do advocate the boycott. We have heard the boycott advocated from the pulpit, as the Chinese were not the ones against whom the boycott was to be directed. Neither were the saloons and theaters to be boycotted, unless they kept open on Sunday. In fact, it was urged that all who did any business on Sunday, no matter how legitimate that business might be, should be boycotted. The lack of Christianity in this proposed boycott was manifest from the fact that the foulest dives were not to be molested if they kept closed on Sunday. *SITI May 20, 1886, page 296.6*

We believe that ere long a large part of the professed church of Christ will go into this business of boycotting. The beloved apostle, looking in prophetic vision to near the end, saw a decree go forth "that no man might buy or sell, save he that had the mark of the beast, or the name of the beast, or the number of his name." *Revelation 13:17*. But of one thing we are certain, that no Christian will ever engage in any such business. When the keeping of Sunday is made a test of citizenship, as is desired by the Religious Amendment Party, then hypocrisy will be at a premium; then the church and the world will be identical; and then boycotting and other kindred abominations may be carried on under the name of religion. *W.SIT May 20, 1886, page 296.7*

May 27, 1886

“Under the Law” The Signs of the Times, 12, 20.

E. J. Waggoner

The text which next claims our consideration is *Galatians 4:21*: “Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law?” A complete understanding of the force of this verse can be had only by (1) a knowledge of the peculiar danger of the Galatians, which made the writing of this epistle necessary; (2) an examination of the remainder of the chapter, which involves (3) a brief consideration of the two covenants. As this is all in the line of our study of the law, and will be very useful in our further investigation, we will take time right here to examine these points. *SITI May 27, 1886, page 310.1*

In the first chapter of Galatians, Paul speaks of his call to the ministry, and his first connection with the church. His call, he says, was not from men, but from God. It was three years after his conversion before he went to Jerusalem, and then the only apostles whom he saw were Peter and James. Therefore he did not receive his knowledge of the gospel from men, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ. *SITI May 27, 1886, page 310.2*

In the second chapter, Paul states the occasion of his second visit to Jerusalem, which was fourteen years after his first visit. The occasion of this visit was the council which was held in Jerusalem, and which forms the subject of the fifteenth chapter of Acts. Certain men had come down from Judea to Antioch, where Paul was laboring, and had taught the brethren, saying, “Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved.” *Acts 15:1*. After much discussion in regard to the matter, the brethren determined that Paul and Barnabas, and a few others, should go up to Jerusalem to lay the matter before the apostles and elders. That the question which came before this council was the one which was troubling the Galatian brethren, in regard to which they were in danger, appears from the second chapter of Galatians. Paul mentions the visit, but assures the brethren that those who “seemed to be somewhat in conference,” that is, the leading men in the council, “added nothing” to him. The gospel had been made known

to him by direct revelation from Jesus Christ, and so he knew the whole truth of the matter before the council convened. Further, he states that after the council, he had a controversy on the very same subject which was there discussed, with Peter, who was acting contrary to the decision of the council. These things show that the danger which threatened the Galatian brethren, and which called out Paul's epistle to them, was the same thing into which the men from Judea tried to lead all of Paul's converts. For the Jews constantly followed Paul around, trying to overthrow his work.*SITI May 27, 1886, page 310.3*

Let us now examine the teaching of these men from Judea. "Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved." Of course all the kindred ordinances of the ceremonial law were included with circumcision. Now why did they want to force circumcision upon these converts from among the Gentiles? The reason given was, in order that they might be saved. Circumcision, they taught, was the one thing indispensable, if they would secure salvation. But the only thing which stands in the way of salvation of all men is sin; and therefore since circumcision was put forth as the condition of salvation, we must conclude that it was urged as a means of justification. But this was directly contrary to the gospel which Paul preached, namely, that justification comes only through Christ. This was indeed "another gospel," which was no gospel at all.*SITI May 27, 1886, page 310.4*

That the seditious ones urged circumcision upon the Gentiles as the means of justification, is still further shown by the words of Peter, who said: "Men and brethren, ye know how that a good while ago, God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel, and believe. And God, which knoweth the hearts, bare them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as he did unto us; and put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith." *Acts 15:7-9*. Peter's argument was that God purposed to treat the Gentiles who believed just as he did the believing Jews, giving both the Holy Ghost, and purifying them by faith, and not by circumcision or by any other work which they could do.*SITI May 27, 1886, page 310.5*

Notice particularly the effect which the teaching of these men from

Judea must necessarily have had on those who accepted it. It led those who accepted it to reject Christ as the means of justification from sin. If they were justified by circumcision, of course they would have no need of Christ. And this was why that doctrine was taught. These men from Judea did not accept Christ; their sole opposition to the preaching of Paul and the other apostles was that Christ was set forth as the only means of justification and future resurrection. See *Acts 4:1, 2*. These men from Judea are sometimes styled "Judaizing Christians," but they were not Christians at all. Their sole work was to oppose the gospel of Christ. And in their hatred of it and of Christ, they went about among the churches, trying to induce the new converts to seek pardon and salvation by circumcision, instead of through Christ. These were the men who were "zealously affecting" the Galatians, with the sole purpose of "excluding" them from the faith of Christ." *Galatians 4:17*. *SITI May 27, 1886, page 310.6*

We have before shown that all who are in sin are "under the law,"-condemned. Then since besides Christ "there is none other name under Heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved" (*Acts 4:12*),-since men are not justified by any works of their own, but solely by faith in Christ,-it follows that all who accepted the teaching of the men from Judea, and were circumcised for justification, were still "under the law." No amount of work, whether it was circumcision or something else, could clear them from the guilt of past sins. Moreover, those who had accepted Christ, and had been forgiven, if they listened to this teaching fell from grace; for to be circumcised with a view to justification thereby, was simply rejecting Christ and repudiating their former profession. And this is just what Paul told them: "Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing." *Galatians 5:2*. Paul did not mean that there was anything wicked in circumcision of itself, for he himself circumcised Timothy, and that, too, after the council at Jerusalem. *Acts 16:1-3*. Timothy's father was a Gentile, although his mother was a Jewess, and if Timothy had not been circumcised, he would not have been allowed to labor with Paul among the Jews in their synagogues. Therefore as a matter of expediency, Paul circumcised Timothy, thus showing that whether a man was circumcised or not, was regarded by him as a matter of no vital importance. See *1 Corinthians 7:19*. But when men submitted to

circumcision as a means of gaining salvation, that moment they rejected Christ, man's only hope, and therefore Christ profited them nothing, Christ cannot help those who reject him. So we see that it was a grave heresy which was being preached to these young Christians. *SITI May 27, 1886, page 310.7*

Note again: The heathen religion was a religion of forms and ceremonies. Some of these ceremonies were of the most licentious nature. Now if the converts from among the heathen could only be induced to rest their hope of salvation on Jewish ceremonies, it would be but a step for them to sink back into their old heathen customs. This was actually the effect that it had on the Galatians; for Paul said to them: "Ye observe days, and months, and times [*Deuteronomy 18:8-10* tells how the Lord regarded this], and years. I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labor in vain." *Galatians 4:10, 11*. Their being circumcised did not lead simply to the substitution of Judaism for Christianity, but to a relapse into heathenism. And thus we see that the Galatians were really going back "under the law," or, as stated in *verse 9*, they were turning to the weak and beggarly elements of the world, to which they were desirous of again being in bondage. *SITI May 27, 1886, page 310.8*

Some may wonder at the expression which Paul uses in *verse 21*, "Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law," etc. Why should Paul charge them with desiring death? For if "under the law" means under sentence of death, he did virtually charge them with desiring death. A parallel passage is found in *Proverbs 8:36*: "They that hate me love death." Now while no one would love death itself, so as to deliberately choose it, people do love sin, not realizing that the end thereof is death. So with those to whom Paul speaks. They desired a certain thing which would bring them under the condemnation of the law; and therefore they could be said to desire to be under the law, although they did not realize that such would be the consequences of their choice. W. *SITI May 27, 1886, page 310.9*

(To be continued.)

"Dr. Munhall on the Sabbath" The Signs of the Times, 12, 20.

E. J. Waggoner

(Concluded.)

The Doctor seemed nettled because some reporters and doctors had poohed at a statement by him that man is built on a seventh-day plan, so that the Sabbath rest is a demand of his physical nature. We are willing to accept that statement. "The Sabbath was made for man," and we believe that the Lord made no mistake in the amount of time which he allotted to men for rest. But this is not given in the Bible as a reason for Sabbath observance. The Sabbath was given to man that he might remember God; and the fact that God commanded its observance is sufficient reason why we should keep it. Notice this fact: Nobody ever heard a Sabbath-keeper urge man's physical necessity as a reason for Sabbath observance; with a Sabbath-keeper, the commandment of God suffices. But the fact that man needs a rest one day in seven is the most prominent reason given for Sunday observance by the advocates of that day. It is the only thing they can urge; but as a Sunday argument it is useless from the fact that God has said nothing about it, and it is applicable to any other day of the week. *SITI May 27, 1886, page 310.10*

In behalf of Sunday as the Sabbath, the Doctor simply read *Acts 20:7*; *1 Corinthians 16:2*; and *Revelation 1:10*, without comment. Since the last mentioned text makes no mention of the first day of the week, and since concerning the other two the Doctor said, "The fact that the disciples met to break bread on the first day of the week is no authority for the sanctification of Sunday," we may safely say that he does not believe that the Bible anywhere authorizes Sunday observance. In fact, we know that he does not, for he said: "The resurrection of Jesus Christ had no more to do with sanctification of Sunday than did his crucifixion on Friday. Some people think that it did, but there is no 'Thus saith the Lord for' it." Again he said: "There is no 'Thus saith the Lord' for keeping the first day of the week, and there is no use and saying there is when there isn't. The seventh day was hallowed by the Lord, and there has been no transfer." *SITI May 27, 1886, page 310.11*

We would that Dr. Munhall's hearers remember these words, and then follow his exhortation to "obey God." But someone may be anxious to know why he keeps Sunday, holding the views that the

does. Well, here is his “reason:”-*SITI May 27, 1886, page 310.12*

“We find evidence that the disciples did keep the first day, and therefore we keep it; though why they kept it I do not know, for they gave no reason, and there is no ‘Thus saith the Lord’ for it.”*SITI May 27, 1886, page 311.1*

The “evidence” that the disciples kept the first day is all found in *Acts 20:7*, and *1 Corinthians 16:2*, which is just no evidence at all. But allowing the Doctor’s claim, that the disciples did keep Sunday, what then? Why, we have been doing something for which they have given no reason, and for which no reason could be given. One of the same disciples charges us to “be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason for the hope that is in you.” How can we do this if we keep Sunday, since the apostles themselves gave no reason for it, and the Lord never commanded it? The fact that the Lord never commanded Sunday observance, and that the apostles, while exhorting Christians to be able to give a reason for their faith and practice, gave no reason for Sunday observance, should convince anybody that the apostles never kept Sunday.*SITI May 27, 1886, page 311.2*

In closing, the Doctor said: “I know that I can’t observe the law of the Sabbath on the seventh day.” Well, then, in the name of common sense, how can the law of the Sabbath be observed? That law enjoins the observance of the seventh day of the week, and no other. This law Dr. Munhall proposes to observe by keeping Sunday! And by the same token we propose to celebrate next Fourth of July the first of August. It will be just as easy for us to rest on the Fourth of July on the first of August, as it is for Dr. Munhall to observe the law of the Sabbath on the first day of the week.*SITI May 27, 1886, page 311.3*

But why cannot the Doctor “observe the law of the Sabbath” on the seventh day, the day which the law of the Sabbath designates? Because “as things are in the world,” it is *inconvenient*! Is this the same man who half an hour before said: “You have no business to forget; you must not think that every desire is to be gratified at the expense of God’s commandment. If your business will suffer if you keep the Sabbath, let it suffer. Obey God. That is all you have to do.

The man who lives up to an honest conviction and does right, must expect to suffer inconvenience”? Yes, it is a very same man who now says that “as things are in this world” he cannot keep the Sabbath. And then in the next breath he urges his hearers “to have a conscience in this matter”!*SITI May 27, 1886, page 311.4*

In Bunyan’s “Pilgrim’s Progress,” we read of one Mr. By-ends, one of whose kinsmen was Mr. Facing-both-ways, who earned his money as a waterman, “looking one way and rowing another.” The Saviour described the same class of men when he said: “The scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses’s seat; all therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do; but do not seek after their works; for they say, and do not.” It was not by accident that Bunyan made Mr. By-ends a relative of Mr. Facing-both-ways; for when a man acknowledges a certain obligation, and then says that circumstances will not allow him to regard it, he faces both ways, and advertises himself as a man who has ends of his own to serve.*SITI May 27, 1886, page 311.5*

We might sum up Dr. Munhall’s discourse as follows:-*SITI May 27, 1886, page 311.6*

1. The law of the Sabbath was given at creation, and simply reaffirmed at Sinai.*SITI May 27, 1886, page 311.7*

2. The seventh day of the week, and no other, is the Sabbath.*SITI May 27, 1886, page 311.8*

3. The Sabbath is a memorial of creation, and was given that men might remember God.*SITI May 27, 1886, page 311.9*

4. Those people and nations that disregard the Sabbath will have to suffer disastrous consequences.*SITI May 27, 1886, page 311.10*

5. No man has any business to forget the Sabbath, or to allow business or pleasure to interfere with his observance of it. God requires us to obey him whether it is convenient or not.*SITI May 27, 1886, page 311.11*

6. The first day of the week is not the Sabbath, and there is no use in saying that it is. God rested upon and sanctified only the seventh

day, and no transfer has ever been made. There is no “Thus saith the Lord” for the observance of Sunday. God never required it.*SITI May 27, 1886, page 311.12*

This is good Bible doctrine: whenever the Doctor preaches such doctrine, we shall be glad to assist him in his work by giving it wide circulation. And in connection with the above, we hope no one will fail to remember Dr. Munhall’s only “reason” for keeping Sunday. It is this:-*SITI May 27, 1886, page 311.13*

“I believe that the apostles kept Sunday, though I don’t know of any reason why they did so. The seventh day of the week is the Sabbath, but it isn’t convenient to keep it.”*SITI May 27, 1886, page 311.14*

In conclusion, we would urge our readers to heed the Doctor’s exhortation to “have a conscience in this matter.” W.*SITI May 27, 1886, page 311.15*

June 3, 1886

“Under the Law. (Concluded.)” *The Signs of the Times*, 12, 21.

E. J. Waggoner

(Concluded.)

We have now learned the danger which threatened the Galatian brethren, and can understand Paul's fear for them, and his statement that they desired to be “under the law,”-in bondage to the elements of the world. It will therefore be a short task to examine the remaining portion of this fourth chapter of Galatians, and note what bearing it has on the law. The apostle continues:-*SITI June 3, 1886, page 326.1*

“Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law? For it is written, that Abraham had two sons, the one by a bondmaid, the other by a free woman. But he who was of the bondwoman was born after the flesh; but he of the freewoman was by promise. Which things are an allegory; for these are the two covenants; the one from the Mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar. For this Agar is Mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children. But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all.” *Galatians 4:21-26.SITI June 3, 1886, page 326.2*

It will be seen at once that in these verses three things are placed in contrast with three other things: Hagar, ancient Jerusalem, and the old covenant are placed in opposition to Sarah, the new Jerusalem, and the new covenant. Ishmael and Isaac stand respectively as representatives of those under the old covenant, and those under the new. It will also be noticed that those who are free are the children of the New Jerusalem, the new covenant, while those in bondage, “under the law,” are children of the old Jerusalem, the old covenant. The explanation of this chapter, then, involves an explanation of the two covenants. This we can do only in the briefest manner.*SITI June 3, 1886, page 326.3*

The first covenant was made with the children of Israel when they

left Egypt. See *Hebrews* 8:8, 9. The terms of that covenant are found in *Exodus* 19:3-8; 24:3-8. They were simply as follows: God promised to make of the Israelites a great nation, a kingdom of priests, if they, in turn, would obey his law. This they promised to do. Thus the covenant, or agreement, was made. The law of God was the basis of the covenant, or that concerning which the covenant was made. See *Exodus* 24:8. *SITI June 3, 1886, page 326.4*

Now notice what this covenant required of the people. The Lord had first promised to do certain things for them if they would obey his voice. Then they heard his voice speaking the law in thunder tones from Sinai, and after that they renewed their promise of obedience, saying, "All that the Lord hath said will we do, and be obedient." *Exodus* 24:7. This was nothing less than an agreement to yield perfect obedience to the law. Those who "hear the law," know that it covers every act or thought of man's entire life. Therefore, if the Jews had fulfilled their promise, they would have merited all the blessings which God promised them; but, unfortunately, they did not, neither could they. They had already broken the law many times, and were sinful by nature, so that it was utterly impossible for them, in their own strength, to yield perfect obedience to it. See *Romans* 8:7, 8; *Galatians* 5:17. Now in this covenant there was no provision for the forgiveness of sins either past or future,-no hint of Christ, through whom alone forgiveness and power to keep the law can come. They had virtually made a promise to make themselves righteous before God. But every one who attempts to do this must fail, and therefore it is truly said that that covenant gendered to bondage. Let no one imagine that we mean that that covenant made them under obligation to keep the law. The obligation to keep the law existed before any covenant was made; but we mean that that covenant left them just where it found them,-in condemnation because of violated law. *SITI June 3, 1886, page 326.5*

Had there never been any other covenant than this, the whole world must have been lost. (*Romans* 3:19.) Some will ask if God did not know that they could not of themselves keep the law perfectly, and if it was not trifling with them to make such a covenant with them. God did indeed know that they had no power to do as they agreed, but in making the covenant he was not trifling with them. The

making of such an agreement was the most forcible way that could be devised to bring home to their minds a sense of their condition. In their vain endeavors to keep the whole law in their own strength, they would learn their need, and that would turn their attention to that other covenant, called the new covenant, but which in reality had been in existence ever since the fall. Here it is:-*SITI June 3, 1886, page 326.6*

“Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah; not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers, in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake, although I was an husband unto them, saith the Lord. But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; after these days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people. And they shall teach no more every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord; for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord; for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more.” *Jeremiah 31:31-34.SITI June 3, 1886, page 326.7*

In what respect does this covenant differ from the other? Is it in regard to the keeping of the law? No; for that is required in both. But in this there is forgiveness of sins, and the blotting out of transgressions. More than this, the law is to be written in the hearts of the people, and that means that they will be enabled to keep it perfectly. See *Psalms 40:8*. This work is done by Christ. Through him pardon is secured, and he enables us to be made the righteousness of God. It will readily be seen that, whereas the other covenant found and left the people in bondage to sin, and under condemnation of death, this covenant enabled them to become free from sin and condemnation. “There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.” *Romans 8:1.SITI June 3, 1886, page 326.8*

Now the application of Paul’s words is easy. Hagar was a bondwoman, and Ishmael, her son, was begotten according to the

flesh. Sarah was a freewoman, and her son, Isaac, was a child of promise, born not according to the flesh, but when humanly speaking, such a thing as the birth of a child was impossible. Since Ishmael “was born after the flesh,” he is a fit type of those who are “in the flesh;” and in this condition are all careless sinners, as well as all who attempt to secure salvation by their own unaided efforts. When men have once sinned, it is contrary to anything in nature that they should ever be made to appear perfectly righteous,-as though they had never sinned. But God, by a miracle of grace, which is manifested through Jesus Christ, causes this to be done, so that the sinner may stand before the law uncondemned. And so those who have obtained this freedom may be fitly represented by Isaac, who was born contrary to the order of nature, solely because of the promise of God.*SITI June 3, 1886, page 326.9*

So likewise, the old Jerusalem, which was rejected of God because it had killed the prophets, and stoned them which were sent to it, and had rejected Christ, is very aptly termed the mother of those who are in bondage because of sin. The New Jerusalem, however, is called the Bride, the Lamb’s wife (See *Revelation 21:2, 9, 10*, and onward); and since Christ is the Everlasting Father (*Isaiah 9:6*), and it is he alone that gives freedom (*Romans 8:1; John 8:33-36*), the city is very properly called the mother of all those who are saved from sin.*SITI June 3, 1886, page 326.10*

“But as then he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the Spirit, even so it is now.” *Galatians 4:20*. This is only another form of what we find in *Galatians 5:17*: “For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh; and these are contrary the one to the other; so that ye cannot do the things that ye would.”*SITI June 3, 1886, page 326.11*

“Nevertheless what saith the Scripture? Cast out the bondwoman and her son; for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman.” *Galatians 4:30*. Exactly; the works of the flesh must be put away, for “they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God.” “They that are Christ’s have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts.” *Galatians 5:24*.*SITI June 3, 1886, page 326.12*

The apostle, having shown the bondage in which all sinners are held, and how Christ alone can set men free, and enable them to do the requirements of the law, says: "So, then, brethren, we are not children of the bondwoman, but of the free." *Galatians 5:1*. Compare this with *Galatians 4:8, 9*. *SITI June 3, 1886, page 326.13*

Here we might leave this portion of Scripture, since we have fully explained *verse 21*, which is all that we set out to do; but the one who has read thus far will scarcely fail to read the verses immediately following the one last quoted, and will doubtless be puzzled over one or two expressions which are there found. A few words will suffice to explain them. We quote:-*SITI June 3, 1886, page 326.14*

"Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing. For I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law. Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace. For we through the Spirit wait for the hope of righteousness by faith." *Galatians 5:2-5*. *SITI June 3, 1886, page 326.15*

The reader will recall what has before been said concerning circumcision and other ceremonies. It is evident that Paul did not mean that circumcision was in itself so terrible a thing that the receiving of it would cause a person to fall from grace; for the apostle himself circumcised Timothy as an act of expediency. See *Acts 16:1-3*. It must be, then, that he refers to circumcision as taught by the men who came down from Judea, and who were trying to turn away Paul's converts from the faith. They urged it as the means of justification. They said: "Except ye be circumcised, ... ye cannot be saved." *Acts 15:1*. But since pardon and justification can be secured through Christ alone, those who adopted circumcision for that purpose, necessarily rejected Christ; and if they had previously accepted Christianity, of course their rejection of Christ was a fall from grace. Christ was of no effect in any one who expected to be justified by his own works. But we, on the contrary, says Paul, "wait for the hope of righteousness by faith." This shows that the mode of justification from sin is the subject still under discussion. *SITI June 3, 1886, page 327.1*

But how about the expression, "I testify to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law"? Does that mean that if a man is circumcised he must keep the law, but that if he is not circumcised he may disregard the law? Not by any means. The law is of universal obligation; all men, whatever their condition, are in duty bound to keep it. It is because this duty rests upon every individual, that all the world are guilty before God; for all have transgressed the law. Since all have transgressed the law, they are condemned. Now "the doers of the law shall be justified." None others can be. But "a doer of the law" is one who can present a record of obedience unbroken by a single sin. Thus it follows that, after all have sinned, by the deeds of the law no flesh can be justified.*SITI June 3, 1886, page 327.2*

Now suppose a man starts out with the determination to secure righteousness without the aid of Christ. What must he do? Why he must do the whole law. Very well; suppose that it is possible for him to keep the law perfectly for the remainder of his life, will he be lacking in anything? Certainly; for the law demands obedience for that part of his life which he spent in sin, before he attempted to do right. Perfect obedience is required of him who would stand as a doer of the law. So Paul virtually says: If you set out to be justified by circumcision, or by any other work, it will be necessary for you to show a perfectly clean record: you must your own self take away those past sins, so that the law will witness to your perfect righteousness,-so that it may appear that you have never sinned. But this he cannot do, and therefore he is in the fullest sense "a debtor,"-eternally a debtor. He is in the condition of the man who owed his lord ten thousand talents, and had nothing with which to pay, and who was cast into prison till he should pay it all. For him there was no hope. To all eternity he must remain a debtor to his lord.*SITI June 3, 1886, page 327.3*

So with the man who seeks to stand justified before God by any works of his own. There is a depth of meaning to the words, "he is a debtor to do the whole law," which the casual reader does not catch. The hopelessness of the bondage into which the man is cast who goes about to establish his own righteousness can scarcely be conceived. In this bondage we all are, or have been. Let us ever rejoice that "with the Lord there is mercy, and with him is plenteous

redemption" (*Psalm 130:7*); and that the blood of Christ cleanseth us from all sin. W.*SITI June 3, 1886, page 327.4*

"A Little Confused" The Signs of the Times, 12, 21.

E. J. Waggoner

The editor of the *Tennessee Baptist*, having received a copy of Professor Pettengell's book, "The Unspeakable Gift," feels moved to do something to stay the tide of "heresy," and gives the following notice:-*SITI June 3, 1886, page 327.5*

"A RICH TREAT FOR OUR SUBSCRIBERS.-We have engaged our stated contributor, A. J. Frost, D. D., of Sacramento, Cal., to review thoroughly the prevailing theory of Conditional Immortality, or Annihilationism. This is a modern phase of old Universalism and Restorationism, which is extensively prevailing in many parts of the North and West, and is destined, at an early date, to be the most popular delusion of this age." *SITI June 3, 1886, page 327.6*

If Mr. Frost knows no more about the doctrine of conditional immortality than the editor of the *Tennessee Baptist* seems to, his review will indeed be "a rich treat." To say that conditional immortality is a modern phase of Universalism and Restorationism is about as true as it would be to say that Presbyterianism is a modern form of Catholicism or that Luther was special emissary of Pope Leo X. or that Christianity, is a modern form of paganism. Conditional immortality is as much different from Universalism as daylight is from darkness. Indeed it is the only doctrine that can successfully combat Universalism. Universalism teaches that when.... their belief and practice; the doctrine of conditional immortality teaches just what the Bible teaches that, "He that believeth on the Son hath life; and he that believeth not the Son shall not see life." The one robs Christ of all his glory, making his sacrifice a useless thing, while the other crowns him "Lord of all." No man can be a Universalist or a Spiritualist so long as he holds to the doctrine of conditional immortality; but the one who believes in natural immortality has no safeguard against either delusion. W.*SITI June 3, 1886, page 327.7*

June 10, 1886

“The Real Point Involved” The Signs of the Times, 12, 22.

E. J. Waggoner

There is one strange thing about this Sunday-sabbath, and that is that an argument which is universally used by its advocates, and is relied on as conclusive, is not considered of any force whatever when used in favor of the Sabbath. For instance, an extended Sunday argument is scarcely ever made without reference to the number of times that Christ met with his disciples on Sunday, and the number of religious meetings held on that day. Now the facts are these: We have a record of just one meeting of Christ and his disciples on the first day of the week, and of but one meeting of people for worship. The first meeting was while the disciples sat at supper in which they were joined by Christ, and the second was an evening meeting just before Paul was to take leave of the brethren at Troas after a week of labor among them. *SITI June 10, 1886, page 342.1*

Concerning Sabbath worship we have the following: It was the “custom” of Jesus to worship in the synagogue on the Sabbath day. *Luke 4:16*. He also told his disciples that because it was made *for* man, not against him, they would now be violating it by doing a charitable action that day. We also find Sabbath meetings spoken of in *Acts 13:11, 42, 44; 17:2, and 18:4*. We find also that it was Paul’s “manner” to hold meetings on the Sabbath. Now if custom is to be taken as evidence, in favor of the day, certainly the verdict must be in favor of the seventh day. *SITI June 10, 1886, page 342.2*

But this is not all, nor is it the main point at all. The mere fact that meetings were held on a certain day proves nothing, because the disciples were accustomed to meet every day, and Christ and the apostles preached every day. Here is a point: The first day of the week is invariably spoken of as “the first day of the week.” No sacred title is ever applied to it. There is absolutely nothing in connection with the mention of it to indicate that any sacredness was attached to it. On the contrary it is spoken of as being devoted to secular employments, and is designated, the same as the other

working days, only by its number. The seventh day, however, the Sabbath, is always spoken of as “the Sabbath”-the rest day. This is wherein we find evidence in favor of the seventh-day Sabbath in the New Testament. Christian men, moved by the Spirit of God to write for Christians, writing at periods varying from five to thirty years after Christ’s ascension, invariably referred to the particular day enjoined in the fourth commandment as “the Sabbath.” Surely, then, there can be no doubt as to what day is the only Sabbath for Christians to keep. The Spirit of God has set its seal on the seventh day, and has declared that is the Sabbath day. *SITI June 10, 1886, page 342.3*

Still further, the inspired apostles have left on record the statement that *only* the seventh day is the Sabbath. There is no question but that the day on which the Jews met for worship was the seventh day of the week. Now Paul, when he was at Antioch, in Pisidia, showed, in the following words, how inconsistent the Jews were in rejecting Christ: “For they that dwell at Jerusalem, and their rulers, because they knew him not, nor yet the voices of the prophets which are read every Sabbath day, they have fulfilled them in condemning him.” *Acts 13:27*. If the Scriptures were read in the Jewish synagogues on the seventh day, which no one will think of denying, then, according to Paul, they were read every Sabbath day, which effectually shuts Sunday out of the claim to be called Sabbath. *SITI June 10, 1886, page 342.4*

The apostle James, also, in an assembly of the apostles and elders, which is generally spoken of as “the first Christian council,” and where the Holy Ghost was present to direct, said, “For Moses of old time hath in every city then that preach him, being *read in the synagogues of every Sabbath day*.” *Acts 15:21*. Here we have, in an assembly of Christians twenty years after the crucifixion, an unmistakably Christian declaration to the fact that the day on which the Jews read the books of Moses in their synagogues,-the seventh day,-is the Sabbath to the exclusion of every other day. *SITI June 10, 1886, page 342.5*

We cannot see how Christians can ignore such facts these. If the Holy Spirit declares that the seventh day is the Sabbath, and the only Sabbath, why should we not say so too? How can we be

Christians if we walk not as Christ and the apostles walked, and talk not as they talked? If holy men spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost, why should not their words be an end of all strife? For our part we will maintain before the world that the seventh day of the week is the only Sabbath, and the day which God and Christ demand shall be kept by Christians; and we know that this position cannot be contradicted by the Scriptures. *W.SITI June 10, 1886, page 342.6*

“A Feature of Catholicism” The Signs of the Times, 12, 22.

E. J. Waggoner

In the “decrees” of the Plenary Council held in Baltimore, the following is found: *-SITI June 10, 1886, page 342.7*

“We earnestly appeal to all Catholics, without distinction, not only to take no part in any movement tending toward a relaxation of the observance of Sunday, but to use their influence and power as citizens to persist in the opposite direction. Let them make it not only a day of rest, but also a day of prayer.” *SITI June 10, 1886, page 342.8*

The *Congregationalist* prints the above with simply the following comment: “Here is a feature of Catholicism which we most heartily endorse.” We doubt if the *Congregationalist* realized the full import of its comment. Sunday observance is indeed a “feature of Catholicism,” and is, in fact, its principal feature, as may be seen by the following: *SITI June 10, 1886, page 342.9*

The apostle Paul gave as the chief characteristic of the papacy that he “opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshiped; so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God.” *2 Thessalonians 2:4*. And the angel told Daniel how the papacy would fulfill the specifications of opposing and exalting himself above God, namely, by thinking to change the law of God. *Daniel 7:25*. In no other way could the Pope exalt himself above God. Of course no power on earth could really make a change in the law of God; but the papacy was to think itself able to do so. That the Catholic Church fills this specification,

putting itself above God, by thinking it has power to change God's law, is evident from its own testimony. *SITI June 10, 1886, page 342.10*

“Ques.-How prove you that the church hath power to command feasts and holy days? *SITI June 10, 1886, page 342.11*

“Ans.-By the very act of changing the Sabbath into Sunday, which Protestants allow all of; and therefore they fondly contradict themselves by keeping Sunday strictly and breaking most other feasts commanded by the same church.”-From *“Abridgement of Christian Doctrine.”SITI June 10, 1886, page 342.12*

“Ques.-Have you any other way of proving that the church has power to institute festivals of precept? *SITI June 10, 1886, page 342.13*

“Ans.-Had she not such power, she could not have done that in which all modern religionists agree with her; she could not have substituted the observance of Sunday, the first day of the week, for the observance of Saturday, the seventh day, a change for which there is no scriptural authority.”-From *the Doctrinal Catechism.SITI June 10, 1886, page 342.14*

To the statement that “all modern religionists agree with her” in substituting Sunday for the Sabbath, we must take exceptions. We agree that she has done it, but we do not agree that she had any right to do it. But some one will say that there was no papacy until about the fifth or sixth century, and that as the Sabbath was changed before that time, it could not have been by the papal power. To this we reply that the “mystery of iniquity” was working even in Paul's day, and that before Justinian's decree making the bishop of Rome head over all the churches, the Catholic Church existed just as really as it did afterwards. All the difference lies in the fact that after that decree the papacy was firmly established, as we may say, on a legal basis. An act performed before the beginning of papal supremacy, was just as much an act of the Catholic Church as one performed afterwards. *SITI June 10, 1886, page 342.15*

In writing of the Trinitarian controversies, which took place in the

time of Constantine, Gibbon points to the two parties as the Arians and the Catholics. The party which finally became dominant, and which Constantine favored, is invariably termed the Catholic party. Thus we see that it is a recognized fact that the Catholic Church, so-called, had an existence in the time of Constantine. Although Constantine was not baptized till near his death, he favored the nominally Christian party from the year 313. He is called "the first Christian Emperor;" and as the influential "Christians" in her day were the Catholics, it follows that any decree issued by him concerning a matter of religion, would be a Catholic decree. It is well known that in the year 321 A.D. Constantine did issue a Sunday edict, and of that edict Chambers's Encyclopedia, article "Sabbath," says:-*SITI June 10, 1886, page 342.16*

"Unquestionably the first law, either ecclesiastical or civil, by which the sabbatical observance of that day (Sunday) is known to have been ordained is the edict of Constantine, A.D. 321."*SITI June 10, 1886, page 342.17*

More testimony to the same effect might be given, but this is sufficient to show that the Catholic Church is responsible for the change that has been made in the Sabbath, a change which has no Scripture warrant, and that this change of the Sabbath is claimed by the Catholic Church as the mark of its authority. It is not simply a feature of the Catholic Church, but it is *the* feature of that church, as we would say before, the *Congregationalist* probably did not realize the import of its own words; but it is a fact, nevertheless, that in indorsing that "feature of Catholicism," it is simply endorsing Catholicism itself. As a Catholic writer said in a book entitled, "A Plain Talk about the Protestantism of To-day." "It is worth its while to remember that this observance of the Sabbath [Sunday]-in which, after all, the only Protestant *worship* consists-not only has no foundation in the Bible, but it is in flagrant contradiction with its letter, which commands rest on the Sabbath, which is Saturday.... Thus the observance of *Sunday* by the Protestants is an homage they pay, in spite of themselves, to the authority of the [Catholic] Church."*SITI June 10, 1886, page 342.18*

What do you say, friends? Will you indorse this "feature of Catholicism," and thus indorse Catholicism itself, with all its

abominations and horrible deeds of blood? This is a question that will not down. The time has come when it must be answered by each person for himself. It may be passed by once or twice, or even more times, but it will surely come again and call more loudly for an answer. The Lord says, "with a loud voice," "If any man worship the beast and his image... The same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God." Would it not be better to serve God by doing just as he says? "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." W.*SITI June 10, 1886, page 342.19*

June 17, 1886

“Religion and Happiness” *The Signs of the Times*, 12, 23.

E. J. Waggoner

“For a person to live and die happy, he must believe in the Lord Jesus Christ.” These words we lately saw in a religious journal and have very often heard similar expressions. The utterance of such a sentiment gives evidence of very crude idea of religion and its object. We think that such a view of religion is injurious yes, for the following reasons:-*SITI June 17, 1886, page 358.1*

1. It fosters selfishness, which is directly opposed to true religion. To make happiness the sole or the principle incentive for gaining religion, is to direct the attention of the individual to himself rather than to God. Love should be the mainspring of every act of the Christian. The reward of the righteous, and the punishment of the ungodly are both set before us, to stimulate us both by hope and by fear; yet these are not the main incentives. “Perfect love casteth out fear.” It is certain that when one is imbued with the spirit of Christ, who said, “My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to finish His work,” he will not do his work through fear of the consequences if he should neglect it. At the birth of Christ the angels sang, “Glory to God and the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men.” *Luke 2:14*. And the first commandment is, “Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all my mind,” while the second is, “Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.” In true religion there is no place for thoughts of self; the glory of God, and the welfare of our fellow-men comprise our whole duty. All the thought the Christian has to take of self is to keep himself unspotted from the world.*SITI June 17, 1886, page 358.2*

2. The idea is injurious because it tends to discouragement of those who hold it. If a man thinks that happiness is the sure and invariable result of belief in Christ, he will surely be discouraged when trouble comes, as it certainly will. When the Thessalonians were in distress, Paul wrote to them “that no man should be moved by these afflictions; for yourselves know that we are appointed there unto.” ¹

Thessalonians 3:3. It is enough for the disciple if he as his Lord, and he was “a man of sorrow, and acquainted with grief.” So he says to his followers: “If they have persecuted me, they will also persecute you.” “Yea, the time cometh, that whosoever killeth you will think that he doeth God service.” “In the world ye shall have tribulation.” True, the Christian will be “joyful in tribulation,” yet it will be tribulation still. *SITI June 17, 1886, page 358.3*

3. The idea that happiness is a constant accompaniment of believe in Christ, is injurious, because it tends to produce false hopes. The careless sinner and the professor who is “at ease in Zion,” having this idea, a fancy that they are in a good ease. They have no trouble, therefore they think the Lord must be pleased with them. They forget that “whom on the Lord loveth chasteneth, and scourgeth every son whom he receiveth.” Pious Job was afflicted almost beyond conception, while the wicked in whom David saw were not in trouble as other men, neither were they plagued like other men. They were in prosperity, and had more than heart could wish. And this was just because they were wicked. The devil can well afford to let his servants dwell in peace, but “all that will live God in Christ Jesus shall suffer persecution.” *SITI June 17, 1886, page 359.1*

A happy death is not in itself any evidence of a person’s piety, nor an assurance that he is sure of final happiness. The psalmist says of the wicked, “There are no bands in their death; but their strength is firm.” *Psalms 73:4.* On the other hand, a good man may, like Hezekiah, be in sore distress at the thought that he is near death. *SITI June 17, 1886, page 359.2*

In a word, the honor and glory of God should be placed before our own happiness. Indeed, happiness should never be sought. If we seek for happiness, it will be sure to escape us, although we may be satisfied with a spurious article. If we glorify God, that is of itself true happiness or blessedness, for Christ declares that they that mourn *are* happy. And this should show the folly of trusting to *feeling* in any case. The basis of the Christian’s hope and trust is not feeling, but knowledge. In the midst of terrible trial he can say, “I *know* that my redeemer liveth;” and although he may feel that because of poverty and low station, he is despised by men, if he

keeps “the commandments of God and faith of Jesus,” he may have, not the *feeling*, but the *assurance* that he pleases God. *W.SITI June 17, 1886, page 359.3*

“Brief Comments on *Romans 7*” The Signs of the Times, 12, 23.

E. J. Waggoner

The seventh chapter of Romans may be said to be *Romans 6:14* expanded. It is a masterly argument for the holiness and perpetuity of the law, and is all the stronger because the nature of the perpetuity of the law is not the subject under discussion. The apostle showing, in the sixth and seventh chapters, what true Christian life is, and how one is brought to be a Christian. The reference to the law are, we may say, incidental, and show how impossible it is to ignore law when speaking of Christian experience. We should give this chapter a brief exposition, dwelling only on the portions that are often misunderstood by the casual reader. *SITI June 17, 1886, page 359.4*

We have already shown from *Romans 6:14; Galatians 5:18-23; 4:4, 5; and 4:21-31*, that “under the law” indicates a condition of condemnation on account of sin; and that persons are freed from the law, or redeemed from under the law, only through faith in Christ, by which they are thenceforth enabled to comply with its just demands. In this chapter the apostle carries out the figure of life and death, introduced in the sixth chapter, representing the one still under the condemnation of the law as alive, and the justified one has been dead. The relations of the man to his sins, to the law, and to Christ, are first indicated by an illustration, which we quote:—*SITI June 17, 1886, page 359.5*

“Know ye not, brethren, (for I speak to them that know the law,) how that the law hath dominion over a man as long as he liveth? For the woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband. So then if, while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress; but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law; so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man.” *Romans 7:1-*

3.SITI June 17, 1886, page 359.6

In this illustration we have four terms, namely, a woman, her first husband, and her second husband, and the law. The law says, "Thou shalt not commit adultery," and thus defines marriage as the union of one woman and one man. Such a union the law sanctions. Not only does the law sanction such a union, but it binds the parties during life. While her husband lives, the law binds the woman to him; but when the husband dies, then of course the union is at an end. Now, says the apostle, she may be married to another man, and she will be no adulteress, because she is freed from the law that bound her to her first husband. How was she freed from that law? By the death of her husband, which rendered further union impossible. But did the law itself change in any particular? Not in the least: It performs the same office that it did before. The law binds the woman to the second husband just the same as it did to the first; and if while her second husband lives she should be married to a third, the law will condemn her as an adulterous just the same as it would if she had married her second husband while the first husband was living. Thus we see that the law is the one thing that remains unchanged. Now read the application.*SITI June 17, 1886, page 359.7*

"Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ; that ye should be married to another, even to him who is raised from the dead, that we should bring forth fruit unto God. For when we were in the flesh, the motions of sins, which were by the law, did work in our members to bring forth fruit unto death. But now we are delivered from the law, that being dead wherein we were held; that we should serve in newness of spirit, and not in the oldness of the letter." *Romans 7:4-6.SITI June 17, 1886, page 359.8*

Here, as in the illustration, we have four parties, namely, the man, his sins, Christ, and the law. In the first place, the man is united to his sins. That is when he is "in the flesh," under the law (*Galatians 5:17, 18*), and unable to please God. *Romans 8:7*. Here is a union in which the law holds him fast. "For when we were in the flesh, the motions of since, which were by the law, did work in our members to bring forth fruit and to death." The apostle says that the sins were

“by the law.” This is the same as “where no law is there is no transgressions.” If no law existed, there could be no such thing as sin, and therefore Paul says that the motions of sin were by the law. “The strength of sin is the law.” Now we say that the law holds the man fast in this union with sin. That does not mean that the law delights to have the man a sinner; nothing of the kind. The law has no choice in the matter. By his own voluntary action the man has transgressed the law and thereby become a sinner, and now the law can do nothing else than declare him to be such. If the man, through fear of the consequences of his sins, or for any other reason, wishes to escape from this union, he cannot. The law still reiterates, “You are a sinner.” If the law could die, or could be made void, then the man at it once would be free; but that cannot be. *SITI June 17, 1886, page 359.9*

There is, however, a way by which the man may be freed from the galling bondage to sin, if he feels it to be a galling bondage, and that is through faith in the death and resurrection of Christ. He may be “justified freely by his grace through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus; whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are passed, to the forbearance of God.” *Romans 3:24, 25*. When “the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ,” has been imputed to the man, the law no longer calls him a sinner. He is justified, freed from the body of sin. *SITI June 17, 1886, page 359.10*

But this freedom from sin, and consequent deliverance from the condemnation of the law, has been accomplished only through Christ. “If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature; old things are passed away; behold, all things have become new. And all things are of God.” *2 Corinthians 5:17, 18*. Now the man is united to Christ, and by the same law which before held him to be a sinner. While he was in the flesh, the law could not for a moment allow that he was righteous; now that he is in Christ, the same law witnesses to his righteousness. The law remains the same; the man only has changed. *SITI June 17, 1886, page 359.11*

Notice the parallel between the illustration and the application. The law binds the woman to her husband. She cannot escape from that

union, even though it be disagreeable to her. But the husband dies, and she is a free woman, and may legally be married to another man. So a man is united to sin, and the law, true to itself, holds him to that account. But by Christ the body of sin is destroyed; and now the man, being free from sin, is united to Christ, and the law sanctions the union. As a woman cannot legally be united to two husbands at the same time, so no person can be united at the same time both to his sins and to Christ. "Ye cannot serve God and mammon." *Matthew 16:24*. Union with Christ while we are in sin is impossible; and if, while professing Christianity, a person still clings to sin, he is guilty of spiritual adultery. "Ye adulterers and adulteresses, know ye not that the friendship with the world is enmity with God?" *James 4:4*. The law sanctions no such union as that. *SITI June 17, 1886, page 359.12*

The reader may, however, think that he detects a flaw in our reasoning, because in the application the apostle tells us that we have to die in order to become united to Christ. This, he will say, is not an exact parallel to the case of a woman whose husband dies that she may be joined to another. The difficulty is only apparent, not real. The parallel is as close as it is possible for any parallel to be. In the illustration the husband dies, and thus the woman may be united to another. Now if you should suppose a case in which the woman died with her first husband, and then have a resurrection, and was thus united to another, we have an exact parallel to the case of the sinner being freed from sin and united to Christ. The case is of sufficient importance to warrant a more detailed investigation. The following verses contain the whole argument:-*SITI June 17, 1886, page 359.13*

"What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? God forbid. How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein? Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection; knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should

not serve sin. For he that is dead is freed from sin.”*SITI June 17, 1886, page 360.1*

“The wages of sin is death.” *Romans 6:23*. The law demands the death of every sinner. But “God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.” *John 3:16*. For Christ “bore our sins in his own body on the tree, that we, being dead to sin, should live unto righteousness.” *1 Peter 2:24*. By baptism we show our belief in the death and resurrection of Christ, and our acceptance of him as a propitiation for our sins. Indeed, by baptism we are joined to Christ: “As many of you as have been baptized in the Christ hath put on Christ.” *Galatians 3:27*. But we are baptized into Christ, by being “baptized into his death.” “We are buried with him by baptism into death.” And thus it is that we receive the penalty of the law; not in person, but in figure. Christ has suffered for sin; and if we are “in him,” we also are accounted as having received the penalty. And since it is by baptism that we become united to him, we become dead to the law and united to Christ at the same time.*SITI June 17, 1886, page 360.2*

“Dead to the law.” What does the apostle mean by that expression? Simply that we have (in Christ) received the penalty of the law, and that it now regards us as dead. To illustrate: A man guilty of stealing is by the law sentenced to a term of years in the penitentiary. He serves his sentence, and then is set at liberty. Now he has no fear of the law. He may go boldly into the court-room, and even into the prison; for he knows that, having received the penalty for his crime, the law will not molest him. Now carry the illustration a little further: A man commits murder and is sentenced to death. When he has been executed, the law is satisfied. Suppose now that it were possible for the man to come to life again. Having received the full penalty of the law, he is, so far as his past offense is concerned, thenceforth considered by the law as a dead man. So with the sinner’s relation to the law of God. It condemned him to death. In Christ he received the death penalty, and now that he is raised to walk in newness of life, the law considers him to be a dead man. He is now a new man; the man who sinned is dead, and the man who takes his place shuns those things which the former man did, and therefore the law declares him to be righteous. In harmony with the

above quotation and explanation are the following words:-*SITI June 17, 1886, page 360.3*

"If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God. Set your affection on things above, not on things on the earth. *For ye are dead*, and your life is hid with Christ in God." *Colossians 3:1-3.SITI June 17, 1886, page 360.4*

Read also of the following statement by the same apostle: "I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me." *Galatians 2:20.SITI June 17, 1886, page 360.5*

Now why was it necessary for us to go through this process of dying and being raised to new life? Because we have upon us a burden of sin from which we could not otherwise be free. Did we get rid of this body of sin by that means? Yes; hear the apostle: "Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin. For he that is dead is freed from sin." The body of sin was the first husband. We became disgusted with that union, and desired to become united to Christ, but could not as long as the first husband was living; and in order for that husband to die, we ourselves have to die. For the moment, both are dead; then we are raised to be henceforth joined to Christ in a new life, because the first husband, the old man, the body of sin, remains dead. So long as that body of sin remains dead, we, although alive in Christ, are dead in the eyes of the law. But if at anytime the old man should come to life by our calling back going back to our old sins, that moment the law would condemn us as adulterers. W.*SITI June 17, 1886, page 360.6*

(To be continued.)

June 24, 1886

“Brief Comments on *Romans 7. (Concluded.)*” *The Signs of the Times*, 12, 24.

E. J. Waggoner

(Concluded.)

The remainder of the seventh chapter of Romans is a graphic account of the steps which lead the sinner to hate the sin in which he was bound, and to his freedom therefrom. It is not, as some have supposed, a Christian experience; it is simply an account of the experience of a man passing from a state of sin, through conviction, to a new creature in Christ. It will be worth our while to give it a little study, that we may learn more of the law's dealings with the sinner. *SITI June 24, 1886, page 374.1*

The apostle first declares (*verse 7*) that the law is not sin; this is proved by the fact that it points out sin. But for the law he could not have known what sin is. “But sin, taking occasion by the commandment, wrought in me all manner of concupiscence. For without the law sin was dead.” *Verse 8*. Here sin is regarded as a person, producing all manner of evil in the heart. And since without the law there would be no sin he says that sin took occasion by the commandment. In the next verse he embodies this idea and carries it farther. He says:-*SITI June 24, 1886, page 374.2*

“For I was alive without the law once; but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died.” *Verse 9. SITI June 24, 1886, page 374.3*

The first clause of this verse presents to us a picture of carnal security. It is the confidence of the man who is insensible to danger. “Without the law” means that the law had not been driven by the Spirit into his heart. Many a man who has read the ten commandments scores of times, has never felt them searching his heart. Therefore his way is right in his own eyes, and he feels secure. An easy mind is by no means a sure test of acceptance with God. It was forgetfulness or ignorance of this fact that caused

David so much trouble. *Psalm 73*. He saw the wicked wholly at ease, and that there were no bands even in their death. But when he learned their end, he found that such a condition is not an enviable one. *SITI June 24, 1886, page 374.4*

But as soon as a personal application of the law is made to one's heart, the sin stands out in bold relief. "When the commandment came, sin revived." The law did not create the sin; it simply brought to his view that which already existed. A room may be very dusty and dirty, yet if it is dark, the filth will not appear. But let a bright light be brought in, and the foulness becomes all too noticeable. So the law of God lights up the dark corners of the heart and reveals the depravity within. *SITI June 24, 1886, page 374.5*

When this had been done, says Paul, "I died." He does not here mean death to sin; for the next verse says: "And the commandment which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death." The law had shown him that he was a sinner, and "the wages of sin is death;" therefore he felt himself to be virtually a dead man. He did not actually die, but he speaks as though that which was inevitable had already come. In like manner the Lord said to Abimelech, who had taken Abraham's wife, "Thou art but a dead man." *Exodus 20:3*. "For sin taking occasion by the commandment, deceived me, and by it slew me." *Romans 7:11*. Sin is deceitful; it arrays itself in a pleasing garb so that to the unsuspecting one it appears to be good. But underneath its pleasing exterior it carries a weapon that wounds to the death all who come in contact with it. *SITI June 24, 1886, page 374.6*

Notwithstanding all that the law had revealed to Paul, he could say, "Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good." *Verse 12*. He would uphold the dignity of the law, and shield it from all blame for his present deplorable condition. Although he had before said that the law, which was ordained to life, he found to be unto death, he insists that it was not the law,—"that which is good" (*verse 13*),—that was made death to him, but that it was sin that condemned him to death, and that the commandment had simply made sin "become exceeding sinful." Happy is the awakened sinner who views the law in this light. Such a one is "not far from the kingdom of Heaven." Unfortunately too

many rail at the law, as though it were the cause of their lost condition, and then, as if they could avert the danger by shutting their eyes, they turn away from the law, and relapse into their old state of false security.*SITI June 24, 1886, page 374.7*

“For we know that the law is spiritual; but I am carnal, sold under sin. For that which I do I allow not; for what I would, that do I not; but what I hate, that do I.” *Romans 7:14, 15.SITI June 24, 1886, page 374.8*

Again we must caution the reader against supposing that in these verses Paul is relating a Christian experience. Up to this point he has shown how any a person is convicted of sin. He has related the experience of one who, when the law convicts him of sin, does not turn from the light, but honestly desires to obey. Now he proceeds to give the experience of one under conviction, until he is made a free man in Christ. He uses the first person and the present tense in order to make the narrative more vivid, as he portrays the sinner’s struggle for freedom. It was once a present matter with him, and is the experience that all pass through, though with various modifications, before they find peace with God.*SITI June 24, 1886, page 374.9*

“Sold under sin.” This idea is carried out in many places. Peter says that the sinner is “in bondage.” *2 Peter 2:19*. Paul says that he is in bondage “to the weak and beggarly elements of the world.” *Galatians 4:3, 9*. He is a slave to sin. *Romans 6:16, 17*. In a future article we shall see the case stated in even stronger terms. The idea is that the sinner is helpless. He may “consent unto the law that it is good” (*verse 16*), and may with his mind serve the law of God (*verse 25*); that is, he may desire to obey it, yet sin has dominion over him, and he is forced to serve the law of sin, namely his natural, sinful habits. As Paul elsewhere says, “They that are in the flesh *cannot* do the things that ye would.” *Galatians 5:17.SITI June 24, 1886, page 374.10*

This is the condition of the awakened sinner. He would do good, but evil is present with him, so that he does the very thing that he has resolved not to do. The flesh is depraved, having no good thing in it, so that although he may determine to do good, he will not find any

power in him to carry out his determination. The trouble is, sin *dwells* in him; it has never been killed. *SITI June 24, 1886, page 374.11*

Let the reader imagine a man bound with fetters and having a dead carcass fastened to him by a strong chain. He is fully conscious of the seriousness of the situation, and knows that death must be the inevitable result. Every day the load which hangs to him becomes more noxious, and the whole air becomes putrid. Imagine the terror of the man as he contemplates the steady and sure approach of a horrible death, and imagine his despair when he finds that all his frantic efforts to escape from the disgusting cause of that death are in vain. It would be impossible for the imagination to overdraw the feelings of horror and despair that would fill the soul of the unfortunate man. This was the condition in which Paul found himself. Sin was upon him as a terrible burden; he knew that unless he could get rid of it and lead a life of righteousness it would sink him into perdition; and he found that his most desperate efforts to get rid of it, and to do the good that he longed to do, were unavailing. It was the law that revealed his condition to him. As he continues to look into that holy law, his sin becomes more and more disgusting to him, and yet the more he looks, the larger and more revolting does the burden of sin become. What shall he do? Must he sink into perdition? In the agony of his despair he cries out, "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from this body of death?" Even as he utters this wail for help, the help appears, and he immediately answers his own question, "I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord." He has found peace and rest in Christ. His condition now is presented in the following words,-a Christian experience:-*SITI June 24, 1886, page 374.12*

"There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death. For what the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh; that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." *Romans 8:1-4. SITI June 24, 1886, page 374.13*

“No condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus,” because they are new creatures. They are not the ones against whom the law had such a terrible indictment. The condemned ones have died, have been crucified with Christ, and now although they live, it is no more they, but Christ dwelling in them. Once sin dwelt in them; now Christ has taken its place. *SITI June 24, 1886, page 374.14*

Verse 2 is a parallel to *Romans 3:21, 22*. The righteousness of Christ being imputed to the sinner, frees him from sin and the fear of death. For a long time he may have tried to make himself righteous, but he found his best deeds so far below what the law requires that they alone would have been sufficient to ruin him. Even if he could have fulfilled the requirements of the law, that would not have removed past transgression. What the law cannot do is to make a sinner righteous. This is not on account of any defect of the law, but is solely owing to the weakness of the flesh. The law points out the disease and shows what a condition of health would be; then the man begins an ineffectual struggle to reach that high condition; the law goads him on until he finds that he has not power to accomplish his desire; and when he has lost all confidence in himself, he accepts Christ as the only source of help, and at once becomes free. Thus the law drives the sinner to Christ that Christ may free him from his past sins and enable him to keep the law. *W.SITI June 24, 1886, page 374.15*

“Little Religion” The Signs of the Times, 12, 24.

E. J. Waggoner

The word “sermon” seems to grate harshly on the ears of many people. Listening to a sermon is considered as sort of penance, which they are constrained to undergo once a week as an expiation for their “shortcomings;” for “shortcomings” also sounds less harsh than “sins.” And so the word “sermonizing” is used to characterize any talk which, being of a serious cast, is consequently disagreeable. This is doubtless why “sermonettes” have become so popular lately. They are ostensibly for children, but we learn that they are preferred by older people. A “sermonette” is supposed to be a diluted sermon-easier to take. And now they have the “churchette.” This, the *Sunday School Times* aptly defines as a

place “where they have sermonettes, and prayerettes, and hymnettes, and creedettes, and commandmentettes, and all the other ‘ettes.” All of this is in harmony with the mistaken idea that religion must be belittled in order to adapt it to children.*SITI June 24, 1886, page 374.16*

July 1, 1886

“When Is It Sunset?” The Signs of the Times, 12, 25.

E. J. Waggoner

A Colorado correspondent sends us the following statement of fact and question:-*SITI July 1, 1886, page 390.1*

“I live a mile from the base of the mountain which is three to five thousand feet higher than where I live. As the mountain is west of us it hides the sun from our view and casts a shadow over us long before it is sunset east of us. Is it *sunset* when the shadow comes on us while the sun is shining east of us?”*SITI July 1, 1886, page 390.2*

No; it is not sunset until the sun has gone down. When we say that the sun has gone down, we do not mean that it has gone behind a cloud, or that some intervening obstruction keeps its rays from coming direct to our eyes; but we mean that the sun is below the horizon and no longer sheds light upon the part of the earth where we live. If a man should spend the entire day on the east side of a barn, he would not think of calling it sunset at two o'clock in the afternoon, just because he could not see the body of the sun, but he would have as good reason to do so as he would under the circumstances indicated by our correspondent.*SITI July 1, 1886, page 390.3*

If we were to go on the principle that the sun has set when we no longer receive its direct rays, a man living in a deep canon would have a very short day. As a matter of fact, the sun sets to such a man at exactly the same time that it does to his neighbor who lives on the plain. He can tell when the sun sets, just the same as the man on the plain can when the day is so cloudy that he cannot see the sun at all. The sun sets when it sinks below the horizon, and not when it passes behind a barn or a mountain.*SITI July 1, 1886, page 390.4*

“The Second Commandment” The Signs of the Times, 12, 25.

E. J. Waggoner

"I wish to know how you understand the second commandment. Does not 'graven image' include statues and busts? and are not all pictures, photographs, or paintings, 'likenesses'? and does not the commandment say *in plain words*, 'Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of the any thing'? If you believe in taking the fourth commandment as it reads, why not the second?" *SITI July 1, 1886, page 390.5*

We understand the second commandment just "as it reads." In this respect we make no difference between it and the fourth. But our correspondent has not quoted it just as it reads. He has omitted an essential part of the commandment. The prohibitory part of the commandment reads thus:-*SITI July 1, 1886, page 390.6*

"Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image or any likeness of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth; thou shalt not bowed down thyself to them, nor serve them." *Exodus 20:4, 5. SITI July 1, 1886, page 390.7*

If the commandment said, "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing," and said no more, it would certainly prohibit paintings, photographs, etc. not only so, but would prohibit also the hewing of timbers for houses or ships, the cutting of garments, the coining of money, the drawing of plans by architects, or the printing of books and papers from types. In fact it would prohibit nearly everything that is done for the support of civilized life. But the commandment does not prohibit these things. On the contrary, immediately after the command was given, God instructed Moses to build a tabernacle according to a *pattern*, and on the walls and curtains of the tabernacle were made, by God's order, figures of cherubim, and two images of cherubim were placed upon the ark. If the second commandment had been designed to prohibit the making of any image or likeness, God would not have immediately charged the people to do that very thing. *SITI July 1, 1886, page 390.8*

The commandment concerning images is not complete without these words: "Thou shalt not bowed down thyself to them, nor serve

them.” This shows under what circumstances it is wrong to make images and likenesses. It is wrong to make them for the purpose of offering them even the slightest measure of worship or reverence. It is wrong to show reverence to images that others have made. It is wrong to bow down to any image, even though the worship of the heart is directed to the true God. This the commandment plainly teaches; and no one has a right to make it teach something different, by quoting only a portion of it. *SITI July 1, 1886, page 390.9*

“Practical Thoughts on *Psalm 63*” The Signs of the Times, 12, 25.

E. J. Waggoner

“O God, thou art my God; early will I seek thee: my soul thirsteth for thee, my flesh longeth for thee in a dry and thirsty land, where no water is; to see thy power and thy glory, so as I have seen thee in the sanctuary.” *Verses 1, 2.* David had correct ideas of his relation to God. He says: “Thou art *my* God.” Too many imagine that God is far off from them, and that they have to make some great exertions to arouse his interest in them. They forget that God is “not far from every one of us; for in him we live, and move, and have our being.” They forget that God has sought us, and is anxiously waiting for us to seek him. They imagine that God is like a man, -holding off those who have done him a wrong, and refusing to be reconciled. They forget that “God commendeth his love toward us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for us” (*Romans 5:8*), and that “God was in Christ, reconciling the world of himself,” and that to his ministers he has committed the word of reconciliation, who in Christ’s stead beg of sinners, “be ye reconciled to God.” 2 *Corinthians 5:19, 20.* *SITI July 1, 1886, page 390.10*

Many people remain at a distance from God, because they forget, or have never heard, that he has proclaimed himself “the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity, and transgression, and sin.” *Exodus 34:6, 7.* “The Lord is merciful and gracious, slow to anger, and plenteous in mercy.” *Psalm 103:8.* He is “long-suffering to usward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance.” 2 *Peter 3:9.* So willing is he to

forgive, that when men seek him, turning him from their wicked thoughts and actions, “he will multiply to pardon.” *Isaiah 55:7*, margin. And so abundant and efficient is his mercy toward them that fear him, that though their sins be as scarlet, “they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool.” *Isaiah 1:18*. Why will not men let the goodness of God lead them to repentance. What more could he have done than he has done? *SITI July 1, 1886, page 390.11*

“Early will I seek thee.” David knew that that was the time to seek the Lord. “Those that seek me early shall find me.” Is not this an indication that, if seeking the Lord is put off, he may not be found? Isaiah says: “Seek ye the Lord while he may be found.” Then there will be a time when he may not be found. “Now is the accepted time.” True, this refers to the gospel age, but it is literally true. We have known men, in this age when the gospel is preached, who could not find the Lord. They had once felt the strivings of the Spirit, but now they could feel no interest in divine things. They would acknowledge the truth of God’s word, but they were indifferent to it. *Now* is the time when the Lord may be found,—just now while you feel that the husks of sin, “the beggarly elements of the world,” are unsatisfying food. Do not stifle the slightest conviction: “Quench not the Spirit.” Says Jesus: “Him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out.” *John 6:37. SITI July 1, 1886, page 390.12*

But it is not sufficient to simply seek early; some start to seek the Lord, but have not a desire sufficiently strong to make them persevere. Said David: “My soul thirsteth for thee, my flesh longeth for thee.” He felt that he must have God. He could not be satisfied without God. When a man feels that way, he gets what he wants. Says Christ: “Blessed are they that do hunger and thirst after righteousness; for they shall be filled.” *Matthew 5:6*. The trouble too often is, that instead of having an intense desire and longing for righteousness, we are simply passively willing to have righteousness. We ask the Lord to help us overcome some sin, with a mental reservation that we may indulge in it once in a while. We don’t like to say, “I *hate* the sins that made thee mourn.” “Hate” seems too strong a word; we still cherish a secret love for the sin. We want (so we think) to be righteous, and yet we feel loth to part with that darling sin. That is very far from hungering and thirsting

after righteousness. Such half-way desire will never result in anything except final defeat. But when the mind is fixed upon Christ; when he is to the soul “the chiefest among ten thousand,” the one “altogether lovely;” when to be like him is the one absorbing desire;- then will he be found. To such the promise is. *SITI July 1, 1886, page 390.13*

“They shall be filled.” Think of that. How much righteousness does that imply? Here is the definition of “fill.” “To make full; to supply with as much as can be held or contained; to put or pour into till no more can be received; to occupy to the whole capacity of.” Now that doesn’t leave any room for anything else. When a man is “*filled* with the fruits of righteousness,” there isn’t going to be any wickedness cropping out. Such a one “keepeth himself, and that wicked one toucheth him not.” *SITI July 1, 1886, page 390.14*

But is such a condition possible? Let us see. Paul told the Ephesians that he prayed to God, “that he would grant you, according to the riches of his glory, to be strengthened with might by his Spirit in the inner man; that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith; that ye being rooted and grounded in love, may be able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height; and to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge, that ye might be *filled with all the fullness of God.*” *Ephesians 3:16-19. SITI July 1, 1886, page 390.15*

Do you know anyone who has realized the answer to that prayer? Such a thing must be possible, for Paul prayed for it, and he says that God is able “to do exceeding abundantly, above all that we ask or think, *according to the power of that worketh in us.*” Ah that’s the secret. There is some power working in us that a stronger than we, “That Christ may *dwell* in your hearts.” Well, Christ was unsullied by the strongest of Satan’s temptations, and if he *dwells* in our hearts, why may not we likewise repel all of Satan’s advances? *SITI July 1, 1886, page 390.16*

Says Paul: “I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me.” *Galatians 2:20.* No man has the strength to resist the devil, but

with Christ to strengthen him he can do all things. "This is the victory that *overcometh* the world, even our faith." 1 *John* 5:4. Not the victory that makes a feeble effort to overcome, and fails; but the victory that does overcome. *SITI July 1, 1886, page 390.17*

What has been done may be done. Zecharias and his wife Elisabeth, "were both righteous before God, walking in all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord *blameless*." *Luke* 1:6. Enoch "walked with God;" and two cannot walk together except they be agreed. Moreover we have the Lord's own testimony concerning Job that he was "A perfect and an upright man, one that feareth God, and escheweth evil." It is true that there was "none like him in the earth;" but the fact that there was one such man shows that there might have been more; and if there might have been more there ought to have been more. *SITI July 1, 1886, page 390.18*

Let it be remembered, however, that this is not a gift suddenly bestowed, but is a constant work. Says David: "My soul followeth hard after the." *Psalms* 63:8. It is not enough simply to seek the Lord early, or even to hunger and thirst after him, unless it is kept up. "This is a faithful saying, and these things I will that thou affirm constantly, that they which have believed God might be careful to maintain good works." *Titus* 3:8. Such a state of righteousness is progressive. "And this I pray, that your love may abound yet more and more in knowledge and in all judgment; that ye may approve things that are excellent; that ye may be blameless till the day of Christ." *Philippians* 1:9, 10. "The path of the just is says the shining light, that shineth more and more on to the perfect day." *Proverbs* 4:18. The Christian can never arrive at a place beyond which there is nothing. Stereotyping is a thing that is done in Christian experience. *SITI July 1, 1886, page 391.1*

As a matter of course, walking with God produces humility. "Behold, his soul which is lifted up is not up right in him." *Habakkuk* 2:4. When a man becomes satisfied with his condition, he ceases to hunger and thirst after righteousness; he ceases to follow hard after God, and consequently he becomes empty. Notwithstanding Job's perfectness, when God revealed himself to him in an especial manner, he said: "I had of heard of thee with the hearing of the ear; but now mine eye seeth thee. Wherefore I abhor myself." *Job* 42:5,

6. The nearer one gets to God, the greater will seem the contrast between God and himself. If it were not so, there would come a time when he would cease to say, "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain," and would ascribe worthiness to himself. That time can never come. *SITI July 1, 1886, page 391.2*

"To see thy power and thy glory, so as I have seen thee in the sanctuary." That is what David longed for. He had been at times wonderfully impressed, during the services in the sanctuary, with the power of the love of God. He had been greatly blessed. Now he wants to see the Lord just as he had seen him in the sanctuary. He believed that a person might enjoy just as much of the blessing of God while about his daily business as when in church. How was it with Daniel? He was prime minister of the kingdom of Babylon, with all the burden of the business of that mighty empire upon him, yet while he was in the palace, doing "the king's business," he received a vision from God. See *Daniel 8:1, 2, 27*. He did not allow business care to separate him from God. "For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the scriptures might have hope." *Romans 15:4*. For what purpose was it told what Daniel was doing when he had that vision, except that we might learn that it is possible to "walk with God," and to have close communion with him, even when burdened with business cares. Daniel had learned to cast his care on the Lord. When a man has learned that, he can say, *SITI July 1, 1886, page 391.3*

"Because thy lovingkindness is better than life, my lips praise thee." He can't help praising the Lord. "Thus will I bless thee while I live; I will lift up my hands in time name." Yes; "they will be still praising thee." *SITI July 1, 1886, page 391.4*

"My soul shall be satisfied as with marrow and fatness; and my mouth shall praise thee with joyful lips; when I remember thee upon my bed, and meditate on thee in the night watches. Because thou hast been my help, therefore in the shadow of thy wings will I rejoice." *Verses 5-7. SITI July 1, 1886, page 391.5*

Continual remembrance of God must result in praise and thanksgiving; and praise to God is a powerful help in overcoming.

Says David: "So will I say praise unto thy name for ever, that I may daily perform my vows." *Psalm 61:8*. Meditation upon God reveals his goodness, and this calls for praise; praise is but an expression of confidence in God, "and this is the victory that overcometh the world, and even our faith." W.*SITI July 1, 1886, page 391.6*

July 8, 1886

“Comments on *Galatians* 3. No. 1” *The Signs of the Times*, 12, 26.

E. J. Waggoner

There is probably no portion of Scripture which is more commonly supposed to give “aid and comfort” to the enemies of the law of God, than the third chapter of Galatians. It is true that there are in this chapter, as in other parts of Paul’s writings, some things “hard to be understood,” but only the unlearned and unstable will wrest them to their own destruction. The student of the Bible may rest assured that the law of God stands fast forever and ever (*Psalms* 111:8), and cannot be overthrown. And he may also remember another thing: those texts which are the most depended upon by antinomians in their opposition to the law, will be found, after careful study, to be strong bulwarks in its support. No weapon formed against God’s law can prosper. “Concerning thy testimonies, I have known of old that thou hast founded them forever.” *Psalms* 119:152. *SITI July 8, 1886, page 406.1*

There is not a point in the third chapter of Galatians that has not been explained in our study of other texts; therefore in our brief study of this chapter we shall only emphasize facts already established. The reader will recall our remarks in a previous article on the particular errors into which the Galatian brethren had fallen, and the object of the epistle to them. It will not be necessary to give more than an outline of the statements there made. Men had come from Judea saying to the young converts, “Except ye be circumcised.... ye cannot be saved.” This was teaching them that their salvation depended on their own works, and was directly contrary to Paul’s teaching, that works outside of Christ amount to nothing. Paul taught that sinners can obtain justification only by the grace of God, through faith in the blood of Christ; those Jews taught that circumcision was the true means of justification. It can readily be seen that the latter teaching was directly subversive of the former, and that the acceptance of it was equivalent to the rejection of Christ. *SITI July 8, 1886, page 406.2*

In harmony with the above idea are the opening words of the third

chapter: "O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you, that ye should not obey the truth, before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth, crucified among you?" Christ and him crucified had been set forth among them, and Christ is "the truth." Through faith in him they had begun the Christian life, and now they were in danger of turning from him and endeavoring to be "made perfect" by their own works. For such a proceeding they justly merited the epithet "foolish." *SITI July 8, 1886, page 406.3*

Abraham is next taken as the model for Christians. "Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness." *Verse 6*. Nothing else but his faith could be counted to him for righteousness, that is, for his past life; for any work that he could do could not take away a single sin. Abraham did works, as it is written, "Because that Abraham obeyed my voice, and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws" (*Genesis 26:5*); but these works were done only through his faith. Works are necessary, but they are of no avail outside of Christ. Paul says:-*SITI July 8, 1886, page 406.4*

"For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God; not of works, lest any man should boast. For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them." *Ephesians 2:8-10. SITI July 8, 1886, page 406.5*

The patriarch was justified by faith, and then by works his faith was made perfect, or shown to be genuine. *James 2:22*. Having shown that even Abraham was not justified before God by his own works, Paul shows that the promise is to none but the children of Abraham; and since the children of Abraham are those only who have the same faith that he had, only those that are of faith can receive the promise. These are his words:-*SITI July 8, 1886, page 406.6*

"Know ye therefore that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham. And the Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed. So then they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham." *Galatians 3:7-9. SITI July 8, 1886, page 406.7*

Following this statement, the apostle emphasizes the fact that we can be justified only by faith, and not by works. He says:-*SITI July 8, 1886, page 406.8*

“For as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse; for it is written, Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them.” *Verse 10.SITI July 8, 1886, page 406.9*

This verse is the cause of much stumbling, and is often wrested from its true meaning, but its explanation is simple, and is contained within the verse itself. It is written, “Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them.” These words are quoted from *Deuteronomy 27:26*, and *Jeremiah 11:2-4*, in both of which places they have unmistakable reference to the ten commandments. The law contains the whole duty of man, and the transgression of it brings death, and therefore the man who fails to obey it comes under the curse of God. But there is no man who has kept the law perfectly. Consequently if any are saved they must have recourse to something outside of the law; for the law cannot justify the sinner. Or, to use the words of Paul, “As many as are of the works of the law [that is, as many as depend upon the law], are under the curse.” They are “under the law;” condemned to death.*SITI July 8, 1886, page 406.10*

“But that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God, it is evident; for, the just shall live by faith. And the law is not of faith; but, the man that doeth them shall live in them.” *Verses 11, 12.SITI July 8, 1886, page 406.11*

This is a repetition of the thought already presented, showing that no man can be just except through faith. It is parallel to *Romans 10:4, 5. W.SITI July 8, 1886, page 406.12*

“The Doctors Disagree” The Signs of the Times, 12, 26.

E. J. Waggoner

The *Baptist Flag* has been publishing some articles by one Dr. Dobbs, who claims that the ten commandments are not moral, and

are not to be obeyed by Christians. This has called out an emphatic protest from Rev. W. A. Jarrel, author of "Old Testament Ethics Vindicated," who writes to the editor of the *Flag* as follows:-*SITI July 8, 1886, page 406.13*

"Permit me to enter my emphatic protest against the position of Dr. C. E. W. Dobbs that the ten Commandments are not the moral law, and that the Sabbath of to-day, is not the same Sabbath which was ordained in Eden, but now put upon the first day.*SITI July 8, 1886, page 406.14*

"Dr. Dobbs' position, while intended to meet Seventh Dayists, only plays into their hands. Besides, it positively contradicts the Baptist position, and is Campbellism. Campbellites argue as he does, while Baptists say of the Sabbath: it "is a positive, moral and perpetual commandment binding on all men.... to be kept holy unto him, which from the beginning of the world to the resurrection of Christ was the last day of the week, and from the resurrection was changed into the first day of the week," etc.-*London Conference of 1689, chapter 22*. The Scriptures are fearfully tortured into the support of Brothers Dobbs' and Smith's position. Had it not been to refute Seventh Dayists, no one would ever have dreamed of sawing off the limb we are all sitting on.*SITI July 8, 1886, page 406.15*

"Whenever I cannot refute heresy without destroying the Ten Commandments, I will, as the lesser of two evils, become the heretic. I have had much to do with debating with Seventh Dayists, and well know they are successfully met only by the old Baptist position, in the above quoted confession. I have not now time to give my reason. But if, when I get some work off my hands, the *Flag* will give the room for a series of articles, I will do so."*SITI July 8, 1886, page 406.16*

Good! We hope Mr. Jarrell will cling to his determination never to attempt to refuse heresy by the ten commandments, and to accept any "heresy" that cannot be overthrown except by destroying them. We heartily thank him for his noble stand for the commandments of God, and for rebuking his brethren in the church who would treat them with contempt. But we are anxious to know how he reconciles this acceptance of the ten commandments with his observance of

Sunday. We know him to be a gentleman and a scholar, one who does not believe in “torturing” Scripture into the support of any theory, and is too wise to saw off the limb on which he sits. He is, moreover, a direct and forcible writer, and therefore whenever his work will allow him to write an article showing how first-day observance can be reconciled with the belief that the fourth commandment is a “Moral and perpetual commandment, binding on all men,” we will gladly give it a place in the SIGNS. We hope to hear from him soon. Meanwhile let it be noted that scarcely any two leading first-day writers are agreed as to the authority for Sunday-keeping. *SITI July 8, 1886, page 406.17*

July 15, 1886

“Peter’s Vision” The Signs of the Times, 12, 27.

E. J. Waggoner

A short time ago we answered a question concerning the use of swine as food, promising to consider Peter’s vision of the net full of beasts if, as we expected, somebody should offer that as Bible authority for pork-eating. It was but a few days before we received a request for an explanation of that vision, with which we cheerfully comply. We will first state the circumstances under which the vision was given; the entire narrative may be found in the tenth chapter of Acts. *SITI July 15, 1886, page 422.1*

A Roman by the name of Cornelius, a centurion, was stationed at Cæsarea. This man, although a Gentile, was very devout and benevolent, serving God to the best of his knowledge. To him an angel of God came one day, telling him that his prayers and all had gone up for a memorial before God, and directing him to send men to Joppa to call for Simon Peter, who would tell him what further he ought to do. Accordingly Cornelius sent two of his household servants and a devout soldier to Joppa, with instructions to bring Simon Peter back with them. But Peter was a Jew, with all the natural Jewish prejudices against associating with Gentiles, and therefore he would have refused to follow the Heaven-directed messengers if the Lord had knocked prepared him for their visit. This was done by means of a vision, which we quote:-*SITI July 15, 1886, page 422.2*

“On the morrow, as they went on their journey, and drew nigh unto the city, Peter went up upon the housetop to pray about the sixth hour; and he became very hungry, and would have eaten: but while they made ready, he fell into a trance, and saw heaven opened, and a certain vessel descending unto him, as it had been a great sheet knit at the four corners, and let down to the earth; wherein were all manner of fourfooted beasts of the earth, and wild beasts, and creeping things, and fowls of the air. And there came a voice to him, Rise, Peter; kill, and eat. But Peter said, Not so, Lord; for I have never eaten any thing that is common or unclean. And the

voice spake unto him again the second time, What God hath cleansed, that call not thou common. This was done thrice: and the vessel was received up again into heaven.” *Acts 10:9-16.SITI July 15, 1886, page 422.3*

Was taught by this? Pork-lovers claim that the Lord meant by this vision to teach that Peter might eat pork, and that everybody else may do likewise. Indeed, many people seem to think that the vision teaches that we ought to eat pork. But why stop at the hog. That sheet contained “all manner of fourfooted beasts of the earth, and wild beasts, and creeping things, and fowls of the air.” Then besides the hog, there must be in it dogs, cats, rats, hyenas, jackals, monkeys, porcupines, weasels, buzzards, vultures, crows, bats, lizards, snails, centipedes, scorpions, toads, etc. Now if that vision meant that we should eat the hog, it meant that we should also eat all other scavengers and reptiles. We say this: If the vision has the slightest thing to do with the hog, which we deny, it teaches: (1) That it is a Christian duty for us to eat him; and (2) That it is equally our duty to eat every beast, fowl, or creeping thing, however filthy it may be. No one can dissent from this; and certainly swine-lovers should not shudder at the thought of eating anything filthy. There is nothing in creation more filthy than the hog; and we cannot see why it should be preferred to crow, bat, buzzard, vulture, hyena, jackal, or any other scavenger.*SITI July 15, 1886, page 422.4*

But now to show what the vision does mean. When the three men that were sent by Cornelius reached Peter’s lodging-place, while he was wondering what the vision could mean, the Spirit said to him: “Behold, three men seek thee. Arise therefore, and give thee down and go with them, doubting nothing; for I have sent them.” *Verses 19, 20.* Notice that Peter did not understand the vision to teach that he might eat hogs, hyenas, buzzards, etc.: he knew that God meant by it to convey to him some important truth. What that truth was he learned before he reached the house of Cornelius the next day, for when he entered and found a company of Gentiles assembled, he said to them: “Ye know how that it is an unlawful thing for a man that is a Jew to keep company, or come unto one of another nation; but God hath showed me that I should not call any man common or unclean.” *Verse 28.* Still later he stated more particularly what learned: “Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons;

but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with him." *Verses 34, 35.SITI July 15, 1886, page 422.5*

That this is what the vision was designed to teach, no one who reads the chapter can deny. And if it teaches this it cannot teach something else entirely different. It was designed to show that God's love to man is not confined to one race, and that, partaking of the divine love, we should as readily preach the gospel or give other aid to the meanest specimen of the most despised heathen race as to the most refined citizens of an enlightened land. By this vision Peter was taught what Paul teaches in *Ephesians 2:11-21*, and what David teaches in *Psalms 68:13*, "Though ye have lien among the pots, yet shall ye be as the wings of a dove covered with silver, and her feathers with yellow gold." The gospel brings all men to the same level, whatever their position or condition in this life. And it seems to us one of the clearest evidences of the perverseness of human nature, that so many can see in this illustration of the divine love to man, nothing more than a divine permission to eat pork. It certainly is a magnificent display of the divine mercy and pity that he forbids the regarding of even *such* persons as unclean. W.*SITI July 15, 1886, page 422.6*

"Something To Be Followed" The Signs of the Times, 12, 27.

E. J. Waggoner

In reply to some queries an exchange has a column of replies, among which is the following categorical answer: "We should *not* follow Christ's example in washing one another's feet." And this notwithstanding Christ's emphatic statement: "If I then, [your] Lord and Master, have washed your feet; ye also *ought* to wash one another's feet. For *I have given you an example*, that ye should do as I have done to you." *John 13:14, 15*. An "example" is something "which is to followed or imitated;" and Christ said that he designed that his disciples should follow his example. He wished them to do as he had done to them. More than this, "ought" implies duty; it is the old form of the past tense of the word "owe" and therefore indicates obligation. If we say a person *ought* to do a certain thing, we indicate that to do that thing is a debt that he owes. So when Christ says, "Ye *ought* to wash one another's feet," he means that

to do so is a duty; it is a debt that Christians owe.*SITI July 15, 1886, page 422.7*

Again Christ says: "If ye know these things, happy are ye are if ye do them." *John 13:17*. "Happy" is equivalent to "blessed." A blessing is pronounced on those who *do* according to Christ's example in this respect. And what if, knowing these things, we do not do them? Certainly the blessings will be withheld.*SITI July 15, 1886, page 422.8*

The matter is as plain as words can make it. True, there is only one mention of it in the Bible; but if those who plead this fact as against the adoption of the ordinance, mean to imply that Christ never did and said the things recorded in the thirteenth chapter of John? We believe not, for we never heard any doubt expressed as to the truthfulness of the account. Then if it is a fact that Christ washed his disciples' feet, and said "Ye also ought to wash one another's feet; for I have given you an example," isn't it just as valid as though the account were repeated fifty times? It certainly is.*SITI July 15, 1886, page 422.9*

We are morally certain that if such evidence could be found in favor of Sunday-keeping, or of infant "baptism," those who believe in these practices would not ask for any stronger testimony in their support. We also know that there are hundreds of men who would shout for exultation if they could find as strong an argument for Sunday-keeping as the thirteenth of John contains for feet-washing. The trouble is, it is too humiliating an ordinance to be generally adopted; and a strong tendency nowadays is to reject all the Bible except Christ's own words, and to reject all of his words that are unpalatable.*SITI July 15, 1886, page 422.10*

"Comments on *Galatians* 3. No. 2" The Signs of the Times, 12, 27.

E. J. Waggoner

The next verse that we come to the *13th*, is another "stone of stumbling" to many, but with an understanding of the *10th verse*, it is impossible to go wrong on this. We quote it with the *14th*:-"For Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a

curse for us; for it is written, 'Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree; that the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith.'" *SITI July 15, 1886, page 422.11*

What is the curse of the law? Is it obedience to the law? No; for it is written, "This is the love of God, that we keep his commandments; and his commandments are not grievous." *1 John 5:3. SITI July 15, 1886, page 422.12*

The psalmist also says: "Blessed are the undefiled in the way, who walk in the law of the Lord." *Psalms 19:1*. Now if the keeping of the law is a blessing, disobedience, with its consequences, must be the curse. And so Paul, after warning the Ephesians against whoredom, covetousness, and idolatry, says: "For because of these things the wrath of God... curse of God cometh upon the children of disobedience." *Ephesians 5:6*. And "the wages of sin is death." So "the curse of the law" is, in a word, death. *SITI July 15, 1886, page 422.13*

That death is the curse from which Christ has redeemed us, is evident from the latter part of the ninth verse. He redeemed us from the curse by being made a curse for us, and the curse which he suffered was his death,-being hanged on a tree, which was absolutely necessary that Christ should be made in all respects like those whom he would redeem. *Hebrews 2:17*. He came to save sinners, therefore he was counted as a sinner. *Isaiah 53:12; 2 Corinthians 5:21*. And being found in fashion as a man, he suffered the curse which hung over guilty man. He died that we might live. And because he was made a curse for us, we may all through faith share in the blessing of Abraham. *SITI July 15, 1886, page 422.14*

"Brethren, I speak after the manner of men; though it be but a man's covenant, yet if it be confirmed, no man disannulleth or addeth thereto. Now to Abraham and his seed were the promise made. He saith not, and to seeds, as of many; but as of one, and to thy seed, which is Christ." *Galatians 3:15, 16. SITI July 15, 1886, page 422.15*

Here the apostle introduces a new point, the conclusion of the argument being, as stated in *verse 21*. That the law is not against

the promises of God. He makes the positive and unquestionable statement that if a covenant be once confirmed it cannot afterwards be altered. Now the covenant was confirmed to Abraham by “two immutable things [God’s promise and his oath] in which it was impossible for God to lie” (*Hebrews 6:15-18*); therefore, as is stated in *verse 17*, the law given from Sinai four hundred and thirty years after, cannot make the promise void, nor destroy the fact that the inheritance is solely by promise. Thus the main idea of the chapter, that God’s grace as manifested in Christ is man’s sole hope, is kept prominent. *SITI July 15, 1886, page 422.16*

But there is still another point which we should not fail to consider in connection with the fifteenth *verse. 1*. Although the law “was four hundred and thirty years after” the covenant with Abraham, it was nevertheless in existence at that time, and long before, and was the basis of that covenant. Said God to Abraham, before making the promise: “Walk before me, and be thou perfect.” *Exodus 17:1*. And in renewing to Isaac the promise made to Abraham, God said it was “because that Abraham obeyed my voice, and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws.” *Exodus 26:5*. Thus the law could not be against the promises of God, because the law was the foundation of the promise. 2. Although the covenant was confirmed in Christ to Abraham, it was only in anticipation. As the first covenant was confirmed by blood,-the blood of beasts,-so the second covenant was also ratified by blood,-the blood of Christ. Christ himself “confirmed the covenant with many for one week,” in the midst of which he shed his blood on the cross, thus affixing the final seal to the covenant of God’s grace. 3. As the commandments were the condition of the Abrahamic covenant, so they are of what is known as “the second covenant,” which is in every respect the same as that made with Abraham. See *Jeremiah 31:33; Hebrews 8:10*. None can deny that in his earthly ministry Christ taught the necessity of obedience to the law of God. See *Matthew 5:17-19; 19:17; Luke 16:17*, etc. Always, in the strongest terms, he proclaimed the enduring nature and obligation of God’s law. Now since the death of Christ was the final ratification of the covenant, and since, as Paul says, when a covenant is confirmed no man can disannul or add thereto, it follows that after the death of Christ, no change in the covenant was possible. And since the law was one of the terms of the covenant, we are assured that not one jot nor one

tittle could pass from it. The fact that God's law cannot be changed, we have learned before; but it is well to emphasize it in connection with the death of Christ. That which some suppose marked the abolition of the law, was that which emphasized its perpetuity. It is admitted, even by antinomians, that the law of God was in full force until the death of Christ, and therefore *Galatians 3:15* should convince them that it is in full force now. Says Paul, "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid; yea, we establish the law." *Romans 3:31*. *SITI July 15, 1886, page 423.1*

Verse 16 also shows that the promise is made only to Christ and to those who are his. In the verses following, 17-26, the apostle shows the relation of the law to the promise of God. "And this I say, that the covenant, that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that is should make the promise of none effect. For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise; but God gave it to Abraham by promise." *Verses 17, 18*. *SITI July 15, 1886, page 423.2*

What covenant was it that "was confirmed before of God in Christ"? Manifestly it was the covenant with Abraham, quoted in verse 8 from *Genesis 12:1-3; 13:14, 15; 17:7, 8, and 22:18*. The promise was that Abraham should be "heir of the world" (*Romans 4:11*), and that in his seed all nations should be blessed. The condition was that he should walk before God and be perfect. *Genesis 17:1-8*. But this was not such a covenant as was made with the Israelites at Horeb. That one contained no reference to Christ, and no provision for the forgiveness of sins; the one with Abraham was confirmed "in Christ" (*Galatians 3:17*) and was made not on condition that he should be righteous by his own unaided efforts, but was made on condition of his having the righteousness of faith. Compare *Romans 4:11* with *3:22-25*. This of course involved the forgiveness of his sins; and so we see that the covenant with Abraham (which is the one referred to in this chapter) was exactly the same as "the second covenant," which is made with us. The covenant made at Horeb, and called "the first covenant," although it was after that made with Abraham, was, as we have before learned, only for the purpose of showing the people the need of the help promised in the Abrahamic or second covenant. *SITI July 15, 1886, page 423.3*

Now the apostle says that the law, which was formally announced from Sinai four hundred thirty years after the covenant with Abraham, cannot disannul that covenant, that it should make the promise of none effect. "For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise; but God gave it to Abraham by promise." That is, if the inheritance be given to those who depend upon their own deeds for justification, then it is not by promise. If it be bestowed because of works, then faith in Christ is ruled out. But this, he says, cannot be; for God gave the inheritance in Abraham by promise, contingent on his faith. *SITI July 15, 1886, page 423.4*

The reader can readily see the force of the apostle's argument. He is trying to convince the Galatians, and with them all men, that out of Christ, there is no salvation. The man who hopes to gain an inheritance in the kingdom of God through his own works, no matter how high his aim may be, will fail. The promise is not for works, lest any man should boast; but it is through faith in Jesus Christ, that he may be "Lord of all." "Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." *Acts 4:12. W.SITI July 15, 1886, page 423.5*

Extracts

Galatians 3:21 That the law is not against the promises of God. *SITI July 15, 1886, page 423.6*

"...the covenant with Abraham, it was nevertheless in existence at that time, and long before, and was the basis of that covenant. Said God to Abraham, before making the promise: "Walk before me, and be thou perfect." *Exodus 17:1*. And in renewing to Isaac the promise made to Abraham, God said it was "because that Abraham obeyed my voice, and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws." *Exodus 26:5*. Thus the law could not be against the promises of God, because the law was the foundation of the promise." *SITI July 15, 1886, page 423.7*

"...the commandments were the condition of the Abrahamic covenant, so they are of what is known as "the second covenant," which is in every respect the same as that made with Abraham. See *Jeremiah 31:33; Hebrews 8:10*." *SITI July 15, 1886, page 423.8*

Galatians 3:15 "... the death of Christ was the final ratification of the covenant, and since, as Paul says, when a covenant is confirmed no man can disannul or add thereto, it follows that after the death of Christ, no change in the covenant was possible. And since the law was one of the terms of the covenant, we are assured that not one jot nor one tittle could pass from it." *SITI July 15, 1886, page 423.9*

"The promise was that Abraham should be "heir of the world" (*Romans 4:11*), and that in his seed all nations should be blessed. The condition was that he should walk before God and be perfect. *Genesis 17:1-8*. But this was not such a covenant as was made with the Israelites at Horeb. That one contained no reference to Christ, and no provision for the forgiveness of sins; the one with Abraham was confirmed "in Christ" (*Galatians 3:17*) and was made not on condition that he should be righteous by his own unaided efforts, but was made on condition of his having the righteousness of faith. Compare *Romans 4:11* with *3:22-25*. This of course involved the forgiveness of his sins; and so we see that the covenant with Abraham (which is the one referred to in this chapter) was exactly the same as "the second covenant," which is made with us. The covenant made at Horeb, and called "the first covenant," although it was after that made with Abraham, was, as we have before learned, only for the purpose of showing the people the need of the help promised in the Abrahamic or second covenant." *SITI July 15, 1886, page 423.10*

"For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise; but God gave it to Abraham by promise." That is, if the inheritance be given to those who depend upon their own deeds for justification, then it is not by promise. If it be bestowed because of works, then faith in Christ is ruled out. But this, he says, cannot be; for God gave the inheritance in Abraham by promise, contingent on his faith." *SITI July 15, 1886, page 423.11*

July 22, 1886

“Comments on *Galatians* 3. No. 3” *The Signs of the Times*, 12, 28.

E. J. Waggoner

“Wherefore then serveth the law?” This is a very pertinent question, and several points need to be borne in mind in reading it. First, the word “serveth” seems to convey to many minds the idea that the law was subservient, or secondary, to something else. There was really no necessity for the insertion of the word by the translators, for it is not expressed in the original. The text reads, *Ti oun ho nomos?* “Why then the law?” This conveys the exact meaning. It may also be more freely rendered, “O, what use, then, is the law?” Second, it must be remembered that questions of this sort are very common in Paul’s writings. After having stated a proposition, he puts himself in the place of a supposed objector, in order that, by answering the question, he may bring out an additional thought. By so doing he anticipates every objection that might be brought against his argument. *SITI July 22, 1886, page 438.1*

Now recall the argument of *verses 16-18*, and you will readily see the force of this question. He has shown that the works of the law will not suffice to gain the promised inheritance for anybody. Faith in Christ is the only condition of salvation. Then the objector speaks up, and says, “Then what is the use of the law? If the inheritance is only by promise, what do men gain by having the law? Is it not rather a detriment to them?” There was need of asking and answering this question; for, notwithstanding Paul’s answer, thousands are to-day asking the same question, and in so doing they imagine that they are making an unanswerable objection against the law. They say, “If we are saved by grace, what need have we of the law?” And what is the answer?—“It was added because of transgression, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made; and it was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator.” *Verse 19. SITI July 22, 1886, page 438.2*

This is a very short answer, but it is full of meaning. Let us examine it candidly and carefully, giving due weight to every word. “It was added.” Here the casual reader is liable to be misled into supposing

that some mathematical process is referred to. It is true that the word (*prostithami*) is most commonly used in the sense of “add,” but every word must be rendered in accordance with its connection. When used in connection with the law, it does not have the sense of “add.” The only other instance in the New Testament where this word is used with reference to the law is *Hebrews 12:19*, where it is rendered “spoken.” Paul says that when the people heard the voice of God proclaiming the law from Sinai, “they that heard entreated that the word should not be spoken unto them any more.” This makes the meaning more clear than if it had been rendered, “They that heard entreated that the word might not be added to them any more.” In fact, that rendering would not bring out any idea at all. The “Emphatic Diaglott” uses “added” in this place, thus: “The hearers of which entreated that not another word should be added to them;” but by the change of construction the expression is equivalent to that in the regular version. So if in *Galatians 3:19* it were rendered “spoken,” the meaning would be brought out more clearly. “It was spoken because of transgression.” Now when the antinomian asks: “What was the use of the law, if the inheritance was only by promise?” Paul answers, “It was spoken because of transgressions.” *SITI July 22, 1886, page 438.3*

“Because of transgressions.” Again the casual reader will say: “You have told us that there can be no transgression when there is no law; yet here you have the law spoken because of transgressions already existing; how is this?” It is all right. There can indeed be no transgression when there is no law; but it must be remembered that the law existed in full force long before it was spoken from Sinai, yes, long before the creation of man. In the temple of God in Heaven the law of God was beneath the throne of God, the basis of his Government. This we have clearly demonstrated. And when it was spoken from Sinai, and a copy of it was given to Moses to place within the ark, there was no more law in existence than there was before. The people of the world were under just as much obligation to keep the law before that time as they were afterward. And that was just why it was then given. The people being under obligation to keep the law perfectly, it was necessary that they should have it in such a form that they could study it carefully. Before the giving of the law upon Sinai, God had conveyed a knowledge of his will to the people by his prophets, as Enoch and

Noah. The people also had in their hearts more or less trace of the law originally written in the heart of man. But the only people who cared to remember God had been in long and cruel bondage to the heathen, and their knowledge of right and wrong had become blunted. Consequently the law was given that wrong might be known to be wrong. If this point be kept in mind, the reader will not become confused by the text, even though he retains the rendering “added” instead of “spoken.” Thus the law was already in existence, and known to man, although only by tradition; but now the Lord added it in written form. But however it is rendered, there is no more reason for supposing that it teaches that the law was here first introduced than there is of supposing that by the “entering” of the law, in *Romans 5:20*, or the “speaking” of it, in *Hebrews 12:19*, the first introduction of the law is indicated. *SITI July 22, 1886, page 438.4*

A parallel to the expression, “It was added [or spoken] because of transgressions,” is found in *Romans 5:20*: “Moreover the law entered that the offense might abound.” The “entering” of the law was at Sinai. Why did it enter?—That the offense (sin) which previously existed might abound. The previous existence of sin implies the previous existence of the law; but it was then formally given that the enormity of sin might be seen. And why was it necessary that the enormity of sin might be seen? Says Paul, “But where sin abounded, grace did much more abound; that as sin hath reigned unto death, even so might grace reign through righteousness unto eternal life, by Jesus Christ our Lord.” That is, it was necessary for men to see the real nature of sin, in order that they might seek the grace that is in Christ, which alone can take away sin. And the more enormous sin appeared, the more comprehensive views could they have of grace; for no matter how greatly sin abounded, grace super-abounded. This will be made more clear further on. *W.SITI July 22, 1886, page 438.5*

“‘Rome Never Changes’” The Signs of the Times, 12, 28.

E. J. Waggoner

The *Sabbath Recorder*, after noting the position of the Catholic Church in regard to secret societies, and its *quasi*-support of

temperance principles, asks: "May we not hope that the time is not far distant when the dominion of the church over the fate and practice of her communicants will be broken, and the era of freedom of conscience shall come again to this priest-ridden church?" No; the Bible forbids us to hope for any change. It is a truth that "Rome never changes." The prophet, speaking of the papal power, says: "I beheld, and the same horn made war with the saints, and prevailed against them; until the Ancient of days came, and the judgment was given to the saints of the Most High, and the time came that the Saints possessed the kingdom." *Daniel 7:21, 22.* Freedom of conscience and Roman Catholicism are incompatible. *SITI July 22, 1886, page 438.6*

July 29, 1886

“Comments on *Galatians* 3. No. 4” The Signs of the Times, 12, 29.

E. J. Waggoner

“Till the seed should come to whom the promise was made.” There is no question of course but that the “seed” is Christ. The sixteenth verse plainly says so. Then what is the coming of the seed? Some have supposed it to be Christ’s first advent, but a little study will show that the second advent is here spoken of. The “seed” is never mentioned except in connection with the promise, and the promise is fulfilled only at the second coming of Christ. The following texts and argument will make this appear:-*SITI July 29, 1886, page 454.1*

In *Genesis* 3:15, the Lord, in pronouncing the curse upon the serpent (Satan), said, “And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it [the seed] shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.” Paul, in his letter to the Romans, many years after Christ had come and had ascended to Heaven, said, “And the God of peace shall bruise Satan under your feet shortly.” *Romans* 16:20. The bruising of a serpent’s head is its destruction; but this was not accomplished at Christ’s first advent, but was something still future. The destruction of Satan begins only at Christ’s second coming. See *Revelation* 20.*SITI July 29, 1886, page 454.2*

Again, in the promise to Abraham it was said, “And thy seed shall possess the gate of his enemies.” *Genesis* 22:17. This was not fulfilled at the first advent of Christ. On the contrary he was then delivered into the hands of his enemies, and they did to him whatsoever they would. He will possess the gate of his enemies only when the following promise is fulfilled: “Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. Thou shalt break them with a rod of iron; thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter’s vessel.” *Psalms* 2:7, 8. And this is fulfilled at Christ’s second advent, when he takes vengeance “on them that know not God and that obey not the gospel,” as is described by the revelator:-*SITI July 29, 1886, page 454.3*

“And I saw heaven opened, and behold, a white horse; and he that sat upon him was called Faithful and True, and in righteousness he doth judge and make war. His eyes were as a flame of fire, and on his head were many crowns; and he had a name written, that no man knew, but he himself. And he was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood; and his name is called The Word of God. And the armies which were in Heaven followed him upon white horses, clothed in fine linen, white and clean. And out of his mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it he should smite the nations; and *he shall rule them with a rod of iron*; and he treadeth the winepress of the fierceness and wrath of Almighty God. And he hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, King of kings, and Lord of lords. And I saw an angel standing in the sun; and he cried with a loud voice, saying to all the fowls that fly in the midst of heaven, Come and gather yourselves together unto the supper of the great God; that ye may eat the flesh of kings, and the flesh of captains, and the flesh of mighty men, and the flesh of horses, and of them that sit on them, and the flesh of all men, both free and bond, both small and great.... And the remnant were slain with the sword of him that sat upon the horse, which sword proceeded out of his mouth: and all the fowls were filled with their flesh.” *Revelation 19:11-21*. Thus he possesses the gate of his enemies. *SITI July 29, 1886, page 454.4*

Again, another part of the promise to the seed was that he should possess the whole earth. See *Psalms 2:7, 8*, where the uttermost parts of the earth are promised to Christ for a possession; also see *Genesis 13:14-17*, and *Romans 4:13*. But when Christ was on earth, he possessed not so much as a place where he could lay his head. *Matthew 8:20*. When, however, the seventh angel sounds (when the mystery of God is to be finished, *Revelation 10:7*), then it will be said: “The kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ.” *Revelation 11:15*. The eighteenth verse says that this is at “the time of the dead, that they should be judged,” showing conclusively that it is at the second coming of Christ. Compare *2 Timothy 4:1*. *SITI July 29, 1886, page 454.5*

Still further, in the prophecy of Ezekiel the promise of the earth to Christ is directly associated with his second coming. The prophet foretells the captivity of the Jews, the succession of the four universal monarchies, and the setting up of the kingdom of God, as

follows:-*SITI July 29, 1886, page 454.6*

“And thou, profane wicked prince of Israel, whose day is come, when iniquity shall have an end, Thus saith the Lord God; Remove the diadem, and take off the crown; this shall not be the same: exalt him that is low, and abase him that is high. I will overturn, overturn, overturn, it: and it shall be no more, until he come whose right it is; and I will give it him.” *Ezekiel 21:25-27.SITI July 29, 1886, page 454.7*

The diadem was taken from the king of Israel when he and his people were carried away to Babylon. At that time Babylon was a universal monarchy. Then three “overturnings” are mentioned, which reach to the second coming of Christ. Thus: The first overturning made Medo-Persia a universal dominion; the second gave the dominion of the world to Grecia; and the third overturning made the empire of Rome fill the world. This was the state of things at Christ’s first advent, and for four hundred years later, and the prophet declared that there should be no more general revolution “until He come whose right it is.” Note the parallel between this and the clause in *Galatians 3:19*, which says, “Till the seed should come to whom the promise was made.” In the light of *Ezekiel 21:25-27* we think there can be no question but that in the latter passage the second coming of Christ is referred to.*SITI July 29, 1886, page 454.8*

Once more: The promise to the seed was that in him all the families of the earth should be blessed. This of course could not be fulfilled as long as any wicked are in existence. But when Christ comes, sitting on the throne of his glory, to destroy sinners out of the earth, “Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world.” *Matthew 25:34.SITI July 29, 1886, page 454.9*

From the above quotations and references it will be seen that the promises to “the seed” are not fulfilled until the second coming of Christ; they all culminate at his second advent. It was willful forgetfulness of this fact that caused the Jews to reject Christ. They read the promises to the seed,-promises of glorious triumph,-and

applied them to the coming of the Messiah; and when they saw none of those promises fulfilled in him, they rejected him. Let us not, like them, fall into grievous error by referring to his first advent those promises to be fulfilled only at his second glorious coming. That was the time of his humiliation, not of his triumph. Christ then came as an offering for sin, and not as the seed to whom the promise was made. When he comes the second time he comes as King of kings and Lord of lords; he comes to take possession of the gates of his enemies, whom he will dash in pieces as a potter's vessel; he comes to take possession of his inheritance, even "the uttermost parts of the earth," and to receive as his own a great multitude whom no man can number. Compare *Revelation 7:9* and *Genesis 13:16*. In short, he comes as "the seed to whom the promise was made." W.*SITI July 29, 1886, page 454.10*

"Plain Facts on the Sunday Question" The Signs of the Times, 12, 29.

E. J. Waggoner

Among the letters on the Sunday question, published in the St. Louis *Republican* of July 4, is one from a Catholic priest, D. S. Phelan, of the St. Louis, which states the facts relative to the Sunday in such a plain language that we reproduce it entire. We earnestly invite all Protestants to give it a careful perusal:-*SITI July 29, 1886, page 454.11*

"St. Louis, July 3.-EDITOR REPUBLICAN: I have been asked m view on the question of Sunday observance. I have no views. It is a matter of positive law. Dogmas of faith and canons of discipline are great and stubborn things; views are trifles light as air. The Sunday is an institution of the church. The attempt to identify it with the Jewish Sabbath, or to make it heir to its rights and ceremonies is futile and absurd. The ceremonial law Moses is abrogated-buried in the same grave with the synagogue. The Lord's day is the creation of the church in its specific form, although the obligation to sanctify one day in the week would seem to be of divine origin. When the church set apart the first day of the week for public worship, she enacted that all her children who reached the years of discretion should first hear mass, and secondly abstain from servile works on that day. This is positive law, and any man's views contrary to this

enactment are treasonable. The mass is the one great sacrifice of the new law, and all the faithful are obliged to assist at on the Lord's day. Sunday is likewise a day of rest-made so by the church's enactment. She says we may not do any work on that day which is of servile or ordinary wage-earning character. *SITI July 29, 1886, page 454.12*

"But how all about games and amusement on the Lord's day? 'What saith the law?' the Church does not condemn them, although she encourages the faithful to works of piety and prepare. She knows the world too well to impose a burden they cannot bear. She is satisfied with what is essential, while counseling what is of supererogation. It would be well for all Christians to spend all of Sunday in church, but the church obliges them to about one hour. *SITI July 29, 1886, page 455.1*

"Why do our separated brethren place so much stress in observing this Sunday ordinance of the Catholic Church? They are more Catholic than the Catholic Church. But they are Catholic only on Sunday. On Friday they are pagans. Why do they eat meat on the latter day? The church, who presented the method of Sunday observance, forbids the use of flesh meat on Friday. Why, too, do they not observe the laws of the Lenten season? They emanate from the same authority which fixed the time and method of the weekly public worship. The Pharisees were in the habit of higgling about trifles, while they neglected the weightier things of the Mosaic law. Our separated brethren are in the same predicament. They take the Sunday from the church, and they get the scare-crow of Christendom, while they throw away the Friday abstinence, and the Lenten fast, not to speak of the annual confession and communion." *SITI July 29, 1886, page 455.2*

The only thing in the above that we would criticize is the implication that by the abrogation of the ceremonial law the Sabbath was also abolished. The fourth commandment had in it nothing of a ceremonial nature, consequently it was not affected by the blotting out of the handwriting of ordinances. So when "the church" set apart Sunday as a demi-semi-holy day, there were too weekly days of worship claiming man's allegiance: one given by man himself; the other, the original Sabbath which God gave to man. We wish now to

call our readers special attention to the following points in the letter of “Father” Phelan:-*SITI July 29, 1886, page 455.3*

1. “The Sunday is an institution of the church.” It has no connection with the Sabbath, and derives none of its “authority” from the command enjoining the observance of what is termed the “Jewish Sabbath.”*SITI July 29, 1886, page 455.4*

2. “The Lord’s day [an erroneous title for Sunday] is the creation of the church, in its specific form, although the obligation to sanctify one day in the week would seem to be of divine origin.” But why should it “see” that the obligation to observe one day in the week is of divine origin? If the Sabbath commandment be abolished along with the ceremonial law, the obligation to observe one day in the week must also be gone; for the fourth commandment is the only place where such obligation is expressed. But if there is now obligation to observe one day in the week, and that of divine origin, it must be derived from the fourth commandment, which specifies particularly which day shall be observed. Note this point: Our Catholic friend distinguishes between the obligation that is of “divine origin,” and the “obligation” which originated in the “church.” This is as it should be. The observance of one day in the week is enjoined by the Creator, in the fourth commandment; the setting apart of the first day, instead of the seventh “according to the commandment,” rests solely on the authority of men. There is nothing divine about it.*SITI July 29, 1886, page 455.5*

3. The same power that set apart the Sunday also originated the mass; and the Sunday was set apart so late for the celebration of this mummary. Notice: The church “is satisfied with what is essential, while counseling what is of supererogation. It would be well for Christians to spend the whole of Sunday in church, but the church obliges them to about one hour.” Outside of that hour, the people may engage in anything except servile work. Thus the only *essential* thing about Sunday is the mass. If professed Protestants want to know how to keep Sunday, why do they not go to the only source of authority on that subject?*SITI July 29, 1886, page 455.6*

The remainder of the letter speaks for itself. We commend to all Protestants the questions which it contains. If they are determined

to follow, and even to exceed, the Catholic ordinance concerning Sunday, why not be consistent, and attend mass on that day, abstain from meat on Friday, and go to confession? But if they are determined to be Protestants indeed, the way is plain. We do not acknowledge the Pope's authority, and the only treason that we know of in matters pertaining to morals, is disobedience to the commandments of God. W.*SITI* July 29, 1886, page 455.7

August 5, 1886

“Comments on *Galatians 3*. No. 5” *The Signs of the Times*, 12, 30.

E. J. Waggoner

In last week's article, texts were quoted to show that the expression, “till the seed should come to whom the promise was made” (*verse 19*), has reference to the second coming of Christ. This is an important point, and we wish to have it well fixed in the mind of the reader. We therefore present a few more thoughts in the same line of argument. Let us first read the eighteenth and nineteenth verses in connection:—*SITI August 5, 1886, page 470.1*

“For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise; but God gave it to Abraham by promise. Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added [spoken] because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made.” *SITI August 5, 1886, page 470.2*

There can be no question but that the “promise” referred to in *verse 19* is the same as that mentioned in *verse 18*. And what is that promise? It is the promise of “the inheritance.” What inheritance was promised to Abraham? In *Romans 4:13* Paul tells us that the promise to Abraham was “that he should be the heir of the world.” This promise must be the same as that discussed in the third chapter of Galatians, because, (1) only one inheritance was promised to Abraham, and (2) the same means of securing the inheritance is given, both in Romans and in Galatians. Compare the two texts: “For the promise, that he should be the heir of the world, was not to Abraham, or to his seed, through the law, but through the righteousness of faith. For if they which are of the law be heirs, faith is made void, and the promise made of none effect.” *Romans 4:13, 14*. “Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made.... And this I say, that the covenant, that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect. For if the inheritance be of the law, it is no more of promise; but God gave it to Abraham by promise.” *Galatians 3:16-18*. That the thought in these two texts is identical, there can be no

shadow of doubt. It therefore needs no further argument to show that the “promise” is the promise of “the inheritance,” and that “the inheritance” is the whole earth, which God gives to Christ, the seed (*Psalms* 2:7, 8), and to all who, by faith in Christ, become children of faithful Abraham (*Galatians* 3:7, 29). And this is at the second coming of Christ. *SITI August 5, 1886, page 470.3*

The next point to be emphasized is that in speaking of the seed, “the inheritance” is in the mind of the apostle. His argument, in outline, is this: The inheritance is given solely on account of faith. To the objection that this makes void the law, he replies that the law was spoken (made more plain) to serve an important purpose in connection with faith, and that it will continue to fill this office until the seed shall come to whom the promise was made, and through whom alone the inheritance can be obtained. The coming of the seed brings the fulfillment of the promise, and, of course, the end of faith. *1 Peter* 1:9. *SITI August 5, 1886, page 470.4*

And when will this take place? For answer, note two texts that have been previously quoted. Through the prophet, Ezekiel the Lord says of the dominion of this earth: “I will overturn, overturn, overturn it; and it shall be no more, until he come whose right it is; and I will give it him.” *Ezekiel* 21:27. And that this refers to the second coming of Christ, he himself showed when he said: “When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory; and before him shall be gathered all nations.... Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world.” *Matthew* 23:31-34. *SITI August 5, 1886, page 470.5*

From the foregoing we think that there can be no doubt in any mind that the apostle has reference in *verse 19* to the second coming of Christ. This will appear even more plainly as we develop the argument which he bases on this point. The next thing for consideration will be the relation which the law sustains to the promise and its fulfillment. This is the objective point of the whole argument; but since the limits of this article will not allow the matter to be presented in such shape that it could well be left for a week, we shall defer a discussion of that question until the next number.

W.*SITI August 5, 1886, page 470.6*

“Ex-parte Evidence” The Signs of the Times, 12, 30.

E. J. Waggoner

In its issue of June 26, 1886, the *Golden Gate* contains the following:-*SITI August 5, 1886, page 471.1*

“Truth is generally determined by the weight of evidence in its favor. Our Adventist friends declare with Job, that there is ‘no knowledge nor device in the grave’-that the soul sleeps after death till the literal resurrection of the body. Now we can bring a great ‘cloud of witnesses’ who were once mortals like us, and who will all declare most positively that they were never more alive nor wide-awake than they are now. Shall we not believe our spirit friends in preference to Job, who evidently did not know what he was talking about, never having had any experience as a spirit separate from the body? It is hardly fair to insist that a man is dead, when he himself declares to the contrary.”*SITI August 5, 1886, page 471.2*

Again, in its issue of July 17, we find the following in an editorial note:-*SITI August 5, 1886, page 471.3*

“Job said that ‘the dead know not anything;’ while the so-called dead come back to us by thousands, and declare that Job was mistaken. Who shall we believe?”*SITI August 5, 1886, page 471.4*

It is not at all surprising that a paper which has no special use for the Bible should persist in giving Job credit for what Solomon wrote; we never knew an opponent of the Bible to be acquainted with its contents. The mistake is not so bad a one, however, for although Job did not use the language attributed to him, he did speak thus of the dead: “His sons come to honor, and he knoweth it not; and they are brought low, but he perceiveth it not of them.” Job’s testimony is directly opposed to Spiritualism, and so the editor of the *Golden Gate* did not go so very far astray. But it is surprising indeed to see a man of his intelligence bring in behalf of Spiritualism a class of evidence that would not be accepted by a Police Judge in a petty larceny case, and then call it “*weight* of evidence.” Here the spirits

are on trial. The Bible charges them with being spirits of devils. We call them up and put the question, "Guilty, or not guilty?" They reply, "Not guilty," and straightway the editor of the *Golden Gate* claps his hands, and says, "I told you so." *SITI August 5, 1886, page 471.5*

The story is told that in a remote country village, a man of limited capacity was elected Justice of the Peace. The first case that came before him was that of a man charged with stealing chickens. To the usual question, the accused replied, "Not guilty." Immediately the Justice prepared to leave the court room. The prosecuting attorney asked in surprise if he were not going on with the trial. The Justice replied, "What's the use? The prisoner admits that he isn't guilty." We always thought that this story was the creation of somebody's imagination; but now we are prepared to believe it. Surely a country justice should not be laughed at for doing that which is done not only by the learned editor of the *Golden Gate*, but by Spiritualists all over the world. *SITI August 5, 1886, page 471.6*

We don't accept the evidence; and we would warn all unsuspecting persons against being imposed upon by such one-sided testimony. When you are asked to believe that there is no death, on the ground that some wonderful spiritual phenomena have been exhibited, remember that the Bible says, "They are the spirits of devils working miracles;" and remember also that the only defense made is on the testimony of the accused themselves. *SITI August 5, 1886, page 471.7*

But this is not all. Not only is there no evidence in behalf of the accused, except their own testimony, but their own testimony is admitted to be worthless. The *Golden Gate* of May 8, 1886, gave an account of a slate-writing séance, together with a *fac-simile* of the messages that were received. In the course of the account, the editor said:-*SITI August 5, 1886, page 471.8*

"It is not claimed that this writing was done, in all instances, or even in any instance, by the spirit giving the name. Much of it, no doubt, is done by the medium's control, or by spirits skilled in the manipulation of the pencil tips; and such spirits act as mediums for those less proficient in the matter. This explains the poor grammar and orthography sometimes witnessed in communications from

spirits who, in earth life, we know would never have committed such mistakes." *SITI August 5, 1886, page 471.9*

In the face of this admission, we are asked if we shall not believe our "spirit friends" when they testify in their own behalf! No; for the most "advanced" Spiritualists admit just what the editor of the *Golden Gate* does, that there is no means of identifying the spirits. We could give abundance of testimony on this point, but prefer to use the recent matter all from the same source. *SITI August 5, 1886, page 471.10*

The case stands thus: Certain spirits do communicate with men. This we all admit. We claim, on the testimony of the Bible, that they are the spirits of devils. Spiritualists claim that they are our "spirit friends," and offer the testimony of the spirits themselves as proof, at the same time telling us, what we would know without being told, that their statements are not to be relied on. And for the sole testimony of the accused, who are known only as liars, we are asked to throw away the Bible, which, by the exact fulfillment of prophecy is covering the whole of the earth's history, as well as by its general testimony concerning human nature, has been demonstrated to be the embodiment of truth. We shall stick "to the law and to the testimony;" and urge all people who are asked by Spiritualists to "try the spirits," to challenge the testimony that is offered. *SITI August 5, 1886, page 471.11*

Christ said that lying is the characteristic of the devil. "He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in them. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own; for he is a liar, and the father of it." It has been shown that the only thing known about these communicating spirits is that they are liars. Do they not in the themselves afford proof of the Bible charge that they are the spirits of devils? *SITI August 5, 1886, page 471.12*

Next week, if we have space, and if not, the week following, we shall answer the question that is so often asked, namely, "If the spirits are the spirits of devils, how is it that they sometimes heal the sick, and in other ways render aid to men?" It is not a difficult question to answer, yet thousands have stumbled over it. W. *SITI*

August 5, 1886, page 471.13

“Back Page” The Signs of the Times, 12, 30.

E. J. Waggoner

Wednesday, July 28, Elder J. N. Loughborough, Elder E. J. Waggoner, and Professor S. Brownsberger, left San Francisco for Eureka, Cal., to attend the Humboldt camp-meeting. To meet the wants of the cause, the California conference is obliged to hold five camp-meetings the present season. This not only shows what a large scope of territory is embraced within the bounds of the Conference, but is a gratifying evidence of the growth of the cause in this State. For all of which we are thankful to God.*SITI August 5, 1886, page 480.1*

August 12, 1886

“Comments on *Galatians* 3. No. 6” The Signs of the Times, 12, 31.

E. J. Waggoner

We now know from the foregoing question, that the answer to the question, “Of what use, then, is the law?” may justly be paraphrased thus: “It was spoken in order that all sin might be perfectly well known to be sin, until the coming of Christ should bring the fulfillment of the promise.” And now before the reader hastily jumps to the conclusion that this implies the doing away of the law at the second coming of Christ, let him carefully note the following points:-*SITI August 12, 1886, page 486.1*

1. The law existed in its fullness before it was “spoken” from Sinai. This has been amply demonstrated. It is the foundation of God’s throne, and was in existence from the beginning of God’s Government. The giving of it from Sinai added no feature that had not existed for ages.*SITI August 12, 1886, page 486.2*

2. It was spoken from Sinai for a special purpose. That purpose, as stated by Paul in *Romans* 5:20, was that sin might be made to appear more plainly than it did before. God hated sin just as much before that time as he did afterward. And there were men who understood fully the nature of sin, and that God required “truth in the inward parts;” but the mass of mankind had wandered so far from God that he could not communicate with them as he did with Adam, Enoch, Noah, and such ones; and the only way that they could constantly know his will was to have it in writing. By the law in written form, they could always know God’s will, just as well as if they could converse with him; for the law is a likeness of his character.*SITI August 12, 1886, page 486.3*

3. The making of sin to abound by the entering of the law, was necessary to the fulfillment of the promise. The inheritance can be given to none but the righteous; there must be no spot in those who inherit the earth. *Matthew* 5:5, 8. It is true that righteousness can be obtained only through Christ, but sins must be confessed before they can be pardoned, and that cannot be done till sin is known. If

the law had not been “spoken,” perfect knowledge of sin could not have been had. The inheritance was not promised through the law, but through faith; but this, instead of making the law unnecessary, called for the clearest statement thereof. The law points out sin; the knowledge of his sinful condition drives the sinner to Christ as the only source of help; Christ imputes to the repentant sinner his own righteousness, which is the righteousness of God, and enables him to live up to the requirements of the law, thus making him “meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light.” *SITI August 12, 1886, page 486.4*

4. When Christ comes, this design will have been accomplished. Under the second covenant the law will have been written in the hearts (see *Jeremiah 31:33*) of all who have desired the better country, and thus they will “all be righteous,” and fit to “inherit the land forever.” *Isaiah 60:21*. They will be righteous because the law is written in their hearts. They will then be as pure as was Adam when he was first created, with this advantage, that their characters will have been fully tested. When that time comes, the prophet says: “And they shall teach no more every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord; for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord.” *Jeremiah 31:34*. It will not be necessary for them to teach one another, (1) because the law will be written in their hearts, and (2) because they can go direct to the great Fountain of truth. The prophet, speaking of the time when the promise shall be fulfilled, says: “And all thy children shall be taught of the Lord; and great shall be the peace of thy children.” *Isaiah 54:13*. *SITI August 12, 1886, page 486.5*

When “the tabernacle of God is with men, and he will dwell with them;” when “they shall see his face; and his name shall be in their foreheads,” there will be no necessity for one man to say to another, “Know the Lord.” When men can come in person to that glorious and awful throne of God, whose foundation is the perfect law of God, and can talk face to face with the author of that law, then there will be no need for copies of the ten commandments written in books, or even engraved on rock of man’s hewing. The preaching of the gospel will be no more heard, and Bible societies will not be known. The law will have done its work in bringing men

to Christ, and thus to perfect obedience to it, and then “They shall all know the Lord,” for his law shall be in their hearts, and his name shall be in their foreheads. *SITI August 12, 1886, page 486.6*

5. To say that when that time shall come there will be no less law than there is now, or than there was in the days of Abraham, or of Adam, or before it was spoken from Sinai, is now unnecessary, for all must see it plainly. Indeed, it will then be far better known than it has been at any time since the fall, for men will literally “walk with God,” as did Adam and Enoch. This point will be still more fully developed when we consider *verses 24 and 25. W.SITI August 12, 1886, page 486.7*

August 19, 1886

“Comments on *Galatians* 3. No. 7” *The Signs of the Times*, 12, 32.

E. J. Waggoner

“And it was ordained by angels in the hand of a mediator.” There is probably no man living who can fully comprehend this passage. We know that when God came down upon Mount Sinai, he was accompanied by ten thousands of his saints (holy ones), *Deuteronomy* 33:2, and that they must have had some part to act in that great event; but what part they acted, no man can tell. The details of all that was done within that dense cloud which veiled Sinai’s top from human gaze, have never been revealed to man. A parallel to this passage in Galatians is found, however, in Stephen’s address to the Jewish Sanhedrim:-*SITI August 19, 1886, page 502.1*

“Ye stiffnecked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost; as your fathers did, so do ye. Which of the prophets have not your fathers persecuted? and they have slain them which showed before of the coming of the Just One; of whom ye have been now the betrayers and murderers; who have received the law by the disposition of angels, and have not kept it.” *Acts 7:51-53. SITI August 19, 1886, page 502.2*

Those wicked men were uncircumcised in heart because they had not kept the law of God. See *Romans* 2:25-29. They had violated the law which forbids murder, although they had received it “by the disposition of angels.” To the same effect the apostle writes to the Hebrews:-*SITI August 19, 1886, page 502.3*

“Therefore we ought to give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard, lest at any time we should let them slip. For if the word spoken by angels was steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward; how shall we escape, if we neglect so great salvation?” *Hebrews 2:1-3. SITI August 19, 1886, page 502.4*

As we said before, it is useless to conjecture on these passages.

Just what part the angels acted in connection with the proclaiming of the law, we cannot tell; we only know that in each of the above texts the statement that is made concerning the angels is made to emphasize the guilt of those who should violate the law, or should reject the gospel, which has reference to the law. With this we must leave this expression,—"it was ordained by angels,"-the only really difficult passage in the chapter.*SITI August 19, 1886, page 502.5*

"In the hand of a mediator. Now a mediator is not a mediator of one, but God is one." *Verse 20*. The expression, "but God is one," indicates that God is one of two parties between whom there is a mediator in whose hand the law was ordained. Now when we read that "there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus" (*1 Timothy 2:5*), the conclusion seems irresistible that the "mediator" in whose hand the law was ordained, or disposed, was none other than the Lord Jesus Christ.*SITI August 19, 1886, page 502.6*

If to any one this conclusion seems unnatural, let him remember that the Son is the brightness of the Father's glory, and the express image of his person, and that by him the worlds were made. *Hebrews 1:1-3*. "For by him were all things created, that are in Heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers; all things were created by him, and for him; and he is before all things, and by him all things consist." *Colossians 1:16, 17*. He is one with the Father (*John 10:30*), and therefore is worthy to be called God, and to be worshiped as God. *John 1:1*. "Without him was not anything made that was made." It would be expected therefore that the active work of proclaiming the law to men should also be performed by the Son. Whatever is done by the Son is the same as if done by the Father.*SITI August 19, 1886, page 502.7*

It will be profitable right here to note how inseparably the law and the gospel are united, and how impossible it is to separate, in any transaction, the Father and the Son. "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth" (*Genesis 1:1*); but it was the Son "by whom he made the worlds." *Hebrews 1:2*. God formed the earth to be inhabited (*Isaiah 45:18*), and therefore man was made in the image of God (*Genesis 1:27*); but before man was made, God said,

“Let us make man in our image, after our likeness.” *Genesis 1:26*. This has unmistakable reference to Him who is “before all things,” and by whom all things were created. *Colossians 1:16, 17*. Man fell, and thereby lost all hope of immortality, for which he was created. Then Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners (*1 Timothy 1:15*); but “God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself.” *2 Corinthians 5:19*. “It is Christ that died, yea rather, that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us” (*Romans 8:31*); but he is not alone in his love, neither does he have to move a heart hardened against man; “for God so love the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.” *John 3:16*. And when God spoke the law from Sinai, he said, “I am the Lord thy God, which have brought thee out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondage” (*Exodus 20:2*); but we know that an angel, in whom was the name of the Lord was with the people, whom they were to obey (*Exodus 23:20, 21*), and who spoke to Moses in the Mount Sinai, when he received the lively oracles to give unto us. *Acts 7:38*. Moreover we are plainly told that it was Christ who was with them in the wilderness, supplying both literal and spiritual food and water. *1 Corinthians 10:1-4*. *SITI August 19, 1886, page 502.8*

Thus in everything that concerns man, we see oneness of thought and action between the Father and the Son. It is not true that “the Jewish age,” so-called, was the administration of stern justice by the Father, and that “the Christian age” is the administration of tender mercy by the Son. If the life of one man had spanned the entire interval between creation and the present time, he could say, “Goodness and mercy have followed me all the days of my life.” There is no change of government between the fall of man and the restoration of all things. As it was the great love of God to the fallen world which moved him to give his only begotten Son for their redemption, we are not surprised to learn that when Christ’s ambassadors pray to men, “Be ye reconciled to God,” it is God himself beseeching sinners to accept his pardon. Even so when we learn that Christ was with the church in the wilderness, that he was upon Mount Sinai, and that it was in his hand that the law was ordained, we are not surprised to hear him say, “Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets; I am not come to destroy,

but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.”*SITI August 19, 1886, page 502.9*

“Is the law then against the promises of God?” *Galatians 3:21*. That it is not was shown by the *18th verse*. It is directly in harmony with the promise, because by it men are enabled to see and forsake their sins, so that they may receive the promise. So the apostle says: “God forbid; for if there had been a law given which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law.”*SITI August 19, 1886, page 502.10*

Righteousness would have been by the law if such a thing had been possible. If by any means men could have received life without the death of Christ, we may be sure that that means it would have been adopted. God is infinite; his love is infinite; therefore it was at an infinite sacrifice that God gave up his Son to die that the world through him might have life. But there was no other way, for the law once violated could not by any possibility give life. It was ordained to life, but sin caused it to be unto death. “But the Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe.” *Galatians 3:22*.*SITI August 19, 1886, page 502.11*

Blessed conclusion? “This is a faithful saying and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners.” *1 Timothy 1:13*. Therefore, since all are concluded under sin, he came to save all. The provision is ample enough for all, but only those who believe can be made partakers. Unfortunately, too many will not acknowledge the authority of God’s law, and will not confess themselves to be sinners, and therefore the “promise by faith of Jesus Christ” cannot be given to them; for we are taught by *verse 22*, that it is necessary for men to be “concluded under sin,” in order that they may be sharers in the promise by faith. This again shows how the law works in harmony with the promise. W.*SITI August 19, 1886, page 502.12*

“Satan as a Deceiver” The Signs of the Times, 12, 32.

E. J. Waggoner

In our last article we showed the admission of Spiritualists themselves that the testimony of the spirits is not to be depended on; and that since they are lying spirits, they must be, as the Bible says, spirits of devils. We know indeed that the spirits that can indicate to man, and work wonders, are spirits of devils because the devils and the angels of God are the only spirits there are. But none of these are the spirits of dead men. Angels, whether good or bad, are an order of beings entirely distinct from men. The Bible declares that "the dead know not in anything;" but angels were never meant, and men never become angels. If it is asked how we know that the spirits of which we speak are not good angels, we reply, that they are lying spirits. They deny the Bible, and the divinity of Christ. A sure test is this: "To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." *Isaiah 8:20. SITI August 19, 1886, page 502.13*

Then the question arises, "If Spiritualism is of the devil, how is it that men are often healed of diseases, and helped in various ways by it?" People will go to clairvoyant physicians, and will patronize the "mind cure," thinking that if they are benefited thereby to any degree, there can be nothing wrong in it. Say they, "The devil wouldn't do people good, would he?" right here is where thousands will be swept into Spiritualism in spite of themselves. *SITI August 19, 1886, page 502.14*

Notice these texts: "And I saw three unclean spirits like frogs come out of the mouth of the dragon, and out of the mouth of the beast, and out of the mouth of the false prophet. For they are the spirits of devils, working miracles, which go forth unto the kings of the earth and of the whole world, to gather them to the battle of that great day of God Almighty." *Revelation 16:13, 14*. "And the beast was taken, and with him the false prophet that wrought miracles before him, with which he deceived them that had received the mark of the beast, and them that worshipped his image. These both were cast alive into a lake of fire burning with brimstone." *Revelation 19:20*. Also in *Revelation 13:13, 14*, we read of the power called "the false prophet," "he doeth great wonders, so that he maketh fire, down from heaven on the earth than the sight of men, and deceive them the that dwell on the earth by the means of those miracles which he had power to do." *SITI August 19, 1886, page 502.15*

These texts show that the devil performs his wonders solely for the purpose of *deception*. To deceive means to impose upon; to delude; to ensnare by artifice. We are deceived only by false pretenses. The gambler deceives the unwary by pretending to be his friend. Very often a man who is a thief at heart deceives a whole community, so that they trust him as an honest man. He will be very kind to them; he may do them great favors until he can gain their confidence and their property. If the libertine should always appear in his true character, he could never seduce the innocent. But he appears as a virtuous man; he talks of virtue and religion; he appears as the embodiment of virtuous sentiment, until he gains a full confidence of his intended victim. Does he practice those seductive arts that show him to be an apt pupil of his master the devil? Indeed, anyone who has lived long in this world need not be told that the worst of men often dissemble and appear to be the best of friends of those whom they would ruin. *SITI August 19, 1886, page 502.16*

If this is so with men, should we be surprised that Satan, the arch deceiver, should do likewise? He is the originator of deception and deceptive arts; and wicked men and seducers are only attempting what he can do to perfection. Paul says that he appears as an angel of light. Now it would be useless for Satan to appear as an angel of light unless he acted as one. Thus we are to understand that, so far as possible, he throws aside, or rather conceals, his devilish character, and appears as a friend. *SITI August 19, 1886, page 503.1*

Let it be borne in mind then that when the Bible says that the devil will work in order to deceive those that dwell on the earth, it virtually tells us that he will do things to gain our confidence and goodwill. But just as the seducer has selfish ends in view when he does good acts, so Satan has an object of his own to serve in all his deceptions, and that is the ruin of mankind. And they should answer those who say, "Well, suppose the devil is behind this clairvoyant healing and mind to cure, if we are helped isn't it all right?" We answer, no. Just as we would not receive favors from a villain who had ends of his own to serve by offering them to us, so we ought not to accept favors at the hands of the devil. We do not care to be under obligation to him, for we are sure that for everything he gives

he will exact more than tenfold in return. By means of his pretended good services, he is now fastening the chains of error around thousands. Remember, he “deceived theth that dwell on the earth by the means of those miracles which he had power to do.” *SITI August 19, 1886, page 503.2*

Then the question has been asked, “Why does God permit the devils to lay their invisible snares for the souls of men? Why does he allow them to be so deceived?” He does not allow them to lay *invisible* snares. His word sheds the clearest light upon them, so that none may be deceived. “We are not ignorant of Satan’s devices,” if we take heed to the lamp of God’s word. But, unfortunately, people will not heed the warning, the Bible is full of admonitions, but these will do no good unless heeded. Says the wise man: “If thou criest after knowledge, and liftest up thy voice for understanding; if thou seekest her as silver, and searchest for her as for hid treasures; then shalt thou understand the fear of the Lord, and find the knowledge of God.... Then shalt thou understand righteousness, and judgment, and equity; yea, every good path.” *Proverbs 3-9. SITI August 19, 1886, page 503.3*

But instead of so doing, men hate (true) knowledge, and do not choose the fear of the Lord; therefore, they eat of the fruit of their own way, and are filled with their own devices. Indeed, the Bible plainly declares that no man is ever led away by the deceptions of Satan unless he first rejects truth. Paul says that Satan works “with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved.” *2 Thessalonians 2:9, 10. SITI August 19, 1886, page 503.4*

To those who are thinking of “trying” the spirits by personal inspection, we would say, Beware. Trust the description that you find in God’s word, and go not into their assemblies. God’s word is a better guide than human sense. Keep as far away from danger as possible; keep off the devil’s ground; in short, keep in Christ, where alone there is safety. W. *SITI August 19, 1886, page 503.5*

August 26, 1886

“Comments on *Galatians* 3. No. 8” The Signs of the Times, 12, 33.

E. J. Waggoner

“But before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed.” *Verse 23.SITI August 26, 1886, page 518.1*

It has been abundantly proved that “under the law” indicates, in general, a state of sin and consequently of condemnation. See the comments on *Romans* 6:14; *Galatians* 4:4, 5, 21; 5:18; and *Romans* 7. The idea of bondage is everywhere connected with sin. It is a cruel master. Paul says: “The law is spiritual; but I am carnal, sold under sin.” In the verse before us, we have the strongest expression on this point that occurs in the Bible. Take earthly laws as an illustration of the fact. When they are violated, the offender is seized as soon as possible, and cast into prison. He is “shut up” to await either the execution of the penalty or a pardon. Of course in earthly affairs miscarriages of justice often take place. Sometimes a culprit is not apprehended, and very often the guilty escape without either sentence or pardon. But from the law of God there is no escape. There is a standing sentence of death on all who violate it, and consequently as soon as a man sins, he brings himself under its curse. He is “condemned already.” Moreover, although sentence may not be executed speedily, God’s Government does not, like human governments, need detectives to ferret out the criminals. “The eyes of the Lord are in every place, beholding the evil and the good.” *Proverbs 15:3.SITI August 26, 1886, page 518.2*

As in human governments the criminal is cast into prison as soon as he is detected, so violators of God’s law are at once “shut up.” As soon as they transgress the law, they are indicted and condemned, and there is not possibility of escape from the threatened penalty. Yes there is just one way of escape. “The righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ” will make the man stand free before God. The sinner, as is described by Paul in *Romans*, 7:14, 24, may strive with all his might to keep the law, and to get rid of the body of death that is fastened to him. But how

can the guilty one help himself when he is “shut up” in prison, “in bondage,” and securely chained to a body of death? All his struggles are fruitless. He makes an effort to escape in this direction, but finds himself confronted by the prison wall; then he makes an effort on the other side, and there the massive wall opposes an effectual barrier to his progress. He is absolutely “shut up” to the faith which may afterwards be revealed as the only means of escape from present guilt, and from the wrath to come. *SITI August 26, 1886, page 518.3*

Peter carries out the same idea when he calls the wicked antediluvians “the spirits in prison,” and says that Christ, by the Spirit, went and preached to them. *1 Peter 3:18-20*. If they had listened to his preaching, they might have been released from prison, for it is the mission of Christ “to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound.” *Isaiah 61:1. SITI August 26, 1886, page 518.4*

Take notice that in every case of just imprisonment it is the law that seizes the criminal, shuts him up, and keeps him confined until his trial and execution. The sheriff, jailer, and executioner are only agents of the law. It is the strong arm of the law that gives power to the prison walls and bolts. But for the violated law, they could have no power to confine a man. So the law is in reality the jailer to every criminal. This idea is carried out in the verse under consideration. The New Version makes it emphatic by saying, “But before faith came, we were kept in ward under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed.” The addition of the words “in ward” is not unwarranted. The Greek is *sugkleismenos*, which carries the idea of confinement, from *kleis*, a key. Alford says on the expression, “were kept in ward”: “Not simply ‘kept,’ as authorized version, but as Chrysostom says, as it were in a fortress.” And this agrees strikingly with Luther’s version, which reads: “*Wurden wir unter dem geaetz ferwahret und ferschosen*.” “We were under the law, guarded and imprisoned.” The word “*ferschosen*” means “locked up,” from *schoß*, a lock, a castle, a fortress. All this agrees with the known office of any law, -to confine within prison walls those who violate it. *SITI August 26, 1886, page 518.5*

“Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ,

that we might be justified by faith.” *Galatians 3:24.SITI August 26, 1886, page 518.6*

The word “schoolmaster” does not convey to us the idea of the original. The Greek is *paidagogos* (*paidagogos*), pedagogue. The *paidagogos* was a slave who attended the children on their way to school, beating them if they were inclined to play truant. He also had charge of them out of school, having the general duty of correcting their manners. We have come to use the word pedagogue as synonymous with school-teacher, but in reality we have nothing which corresponds to the ancient *paidagogos*. In the New Version the word is rendered “tutor,” the first definition of which is, “One who guards, protects, watches over, or has the care of another.” The word occurs in but one other place in the New Testament, in *1 Corinthians 4:15*, where in King James’s Version it is rendered “instructor.” “Though ye have ten thousand instructors in Christ, yet have ye not many fathers; for in Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the gospel.” Here the same idea is conveyed as in *Galatians 5:24, 25*. The Corinthians might have many *tutors*, many who would lay down the law to them, and show them their errors, but they had not many, who, like Paul, would preach “Christ, and him crucified,” and with the tenderness of a father win them to faith in Christ. The old meaning of “pedagogue” still attaches to the word “tutor,” for it is very common to speak of “tutoring” some person, the idea being that of disciplining, of correcting with authority.*SITI August 26, 1886, page 518.7*

This idea is still further carried out in Luther’s translation, where the Greek word *paidagogos* is rendered *zuchtmeister*, which means “a master of a house of corrections,” “a task-master” “a jailer.” Before faith came we were kept in prison, under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed; wherefore the law was our master in that house of correction, to lead us to Christ, that we might be justified by faith.*SITI August 26, 1886, page 518.8*

The reader will notice that the idea that the law acts as a jailer to sinners does not conflict with the idea that it also acts as a tutor, or pedagogue. It acts as pedagogue by virtue of its office as jailer. As jailer it shuts us up in a stronghold from which we cannot escape. Now the more galling this imprisonment is made, the more our

desire to escape is increased; and since there is no means of escape except through faith in Jesus Christ, it follows that the more of a jailer we feel the law to be, the more of a pedagogue it becomes, forcing us to flee for refuge to the hope set before us. *SITI August 26, 1886, page 518.9*

This office the law now has, and it has no other. It cannot pardon; it can only point out our sin. It is this which, directed by the Spirit of God, convicts of sin. Stung by his awakened conscience, the guilty one seeks peace and rest, but the law relentlessly charges him with his sin. All that it will do is to deepen convictions, and thus add to the load that weighs down the sinner. Finally, when he loses confidence in himself, and cries out, "O wretched man that I am," he is forced to cast himself at the feet of Jesus, saying, "Lord be merciful to me, a sinner." This is the only avenue of escape, and it is one that never fails. Thus the law literally drives the sinner to Christ, by shutting up every other way of freedom from guilt. And when the sinner has come to Christ, he learns from the one whose life is but the embodiment of the righteousness of the law. He is thus exhorted to "grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." *2 Peter 3:18*. Christ says: "Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me." *Matthew 11:29*. He is "the way, the truth, and the life" (*John 14:6*), that is, the law in its perfection. In Christ he may perform good works, because he walks at liberty. As the justified one abides in Christ and Christ in him (*John 15:4*), he is enabled finally to grow "unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ." *SITI August 26, 1886, page 518.10*

"But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster. For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." *Galatians 3:25-27*. *SITI August 26, 1886, page 518.11*

The best comment on the expression, "after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster," is found in *Romans 8:1-4*. "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit. For the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death. For what the law could not do, in that it

was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh; that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.”*SITI August 26, 1886, page 518.12*

Or this: “For sin shall not have dominion over you; for ye are not under the law, but under grace. What then? Shall we sin, because we are not under the law, but under grace? God forbid.” *Romans 6:14, 15.SITI August 26, 1886, page 518.13*

Still another comment on *Galatians 3:22-25*, and a parallel passage is found in *Romans 3:20-25*: “Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight; for by the law is the knowledge of sin. But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe; for there is no difference; for all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God; being justified freely by his grace through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God.”*SITI August 26, 1886, page 518.14*

Not only may the above text be applied the same as *Galatians 3:20-25*, but it must be applied to the same thing, for the argument in each place is exactly the same.*SITI August 26, 1886, page 518.15*

“For as many of you as have been baptized into Jesus Christ, have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus. And if ye be Christ’s then are ye Abraham’s seed, and heirs according to the promise.” *Galatians 3:27-29.SITI August 26, 1886, page 518.16*

This closes the chapter, and the argument. In the fourth chapter, an exposition of which has been given, the apostle goes over the ground in another way, to bring out additional points. There, as here, Christ is the focal point. Baptism is for the remission of sins. We are buried with Christ by baptism into death, and by that act we “put on Christ.” And if we are Christ’s, which honor we attain to only by the exercise of faith, then we are children of faithful Abraham,

and with him are heirs of the promise. In this way, and in this way alone, can we be made “meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light. *W.SITI August 26, 1886, page 518.17*

“Humboldt County Camp-Meeting” The Signs of the Times, 12, 33.

E. J. Waggoner

This meeting was held in Eureka, on the same ground as the camp-meeting last year, a beautiful alder grove but a short walk from the business center of the city. On our arrival we found that the ground had been well cleared of underbrush and rocks. And that all the lumber necessary for pitching the tents have been procured. The brethren in the vicinity took hold faithfully to assist in the preparation for the meeting, doing a team work, etc., so that when it was time for the meeting to begin, everything was ready. *SITI August 26, 1886, page 519.1*

The camp, although small, presented a very neat appearance. The tents were arranged in the form of a hollow square, with the large tent occupying the principal part of one side. Every tent was floored, sufficient lumber for that purpose having been donated by friendly citizens. The encampment was inclosed, and well lighted. *SITI August 26, 1886, page 519.2*

The Sabbath-keepers in Humboldt County were well represented, about two-thirds of the entire number being present. We hope that by another year those who enjoyed the meeting just passed will have convinced every Sabbath-keeper in the county that their camp-meeting is something that they cannot afford to miss. *SITI August 26, 1886, page 519.3*

There being no business to transact, all the time of the meeting was devoted to religious services and general instruction. There were forty-five services besides the Sabbath-school. Of these, seven were children meetings, once each day, and twenty were preaching or Bible-reading services. The remainder were prayer and social meetings, and meetings for instruction in missionary work and on other important topics. *SITI August 26, 1886, page 519.4*

There were no purely theoretical sermons given, it was sought to show the practical importance of all the doctrines presented, and their bearing on our daily life. Our duty to God and to each other, the love of God to us, and how which should beget in us faith and courage, and also tenderness and love for the brethren, were dwelt upon, and the Lord blessed the efforts. The blessed, melting influence of the Holy Spirit was manifest from the first to the last. We believe that many received new views of truth and beauty, and will be better able than ever before to withstand the assaults of Satan.*SITI August 26, 1886, page 519.5*

The attendance from the outside was not large, but was quite regular, and the attention and order were excellent. We were never present where there was more perfect quiet and order, and we never before saw so much reverence manifested by unbelievers toward religious worship. The people of Humboldt County, and especially of Eureka, have shown themselves generous and hospitable, and we believe that there is on this Coast no better field for labor.*SITI August 26, 1886, page 519.6*

The general verdict at the close of the meeting was that it had been too short. We had never before met any of the Sabbath-keepers in that section, save two or three, but we left them feeling that we were parting from dear brethren and sisters. Those who are united by the bonds of Christian fellowship cannot long remain strangers. Personally, we felt much strengthened by the meeting. We pray for the continued blessing of God on his cause and people in Humboldt County. W.*SITI August 26, 1886, page 519.7*

September 2, 1886

“Comments on *Galatians* 3. No. 9” The Signs of the Times, 12, 34.

E. J. Waggoner

We think the reader who has carefully followed us through the seventh of Romans and the third of Galatians, will have no difficulty in seeing how thoroughly the majesty of the law is vindicated throughout, and its perpetuity shown, and also how beautiful is the harmony between the law and the gospel. Right here we wish to quote a pertinent passage from John Wesley:-*SITI September 2, 1886, page 534.1*

“It is the ordinary method of the Spirit of God, to convict sinners by the law. It is this, which being set home on the conscience, generally breaks the rock in pieces. It is more especially this part of the word of God which is quick and powerful, full of life and energy, and ‘sharper than any two-edged sword.’ This, in the hand of God and of those whom he hath sent, pierces through all the folds of a deceitful heart, and, ‘divides asunder even the soul and spirit;’ yea, as it were, the very ‘joints and marrow.’ By this is the sinner discovered to himself. All his fig leaves are torn away, and he sees that he is ‘wretched, and poor, and miserable, and blind, and naked.’ The law flashes conviction on every side. He feels himself a mere sinner. He has nothing to pay. His ‘mouth is stopped,’ and he stands ‘guilty before God.’ *SITI September 2, 1886, page 534.2*

“To slay the sinner is the first use of the law; to destroy the life and strength wherein he trusts, and convince him that he is dead while he liveth; not only under the sentence of death, but actually dead unto God, void of all spiritual life, ‘dead in trespasses and sins.’ The second use of it is to bring him unto life, unto Christ that he may live. It is true, in performing both these offices, it acts the part of a severe schoolmaster. It drives us by force, rather than draws us by love. And yet love is the spring of all. It is the spirit of love which, by this painful means, tears away our confidence in the flesh, which leaves us no broken reed whereon to trust, and so constrains the sinner, stripped of all, to cry out in the bitterness of his soul, or groan in the depth of his heart,-*SITI September 2, 1886, page 534.3*

'I give up every plea beside,-

Lord, I am damned, but thou hast died.'*SITI September 2, 1886, page 534.4*

"The third use of the law is to keep us alive. It is the grand means whereby the Holy Spirit prepares the believer for larger communications of the life of God. I am afraid this great and important truth is little understood, not only by the world, but even by many whom God hath taken out of the world, who are real children of God by faith. Many of these lay it down as an unquestioned truth that when we come to Christ we have done with the law, and that in this sense 'Christ is the end of the law to every one that believeth.' 'The end of the law'-so he is 'for righteousness,' for justification, 'to every one that believeth.' Herein the law is at an end. It justifies none, but only brings them to Christ, who is also, in another respect, the end, or scope of the law,-the point at which it continually aims. But when it has brought us to him, it has yet a farther office, namely, to keep us with him. For it is continually exciting all believers, the more they see of its height, and depth, and length, and breadth, to exhort one another so much the more:-*SITI September 2, 1886, page 534.5*

'Closer and closer let us cleave

To his beloved embrace;

Expect his fullness to receive,

And grace to answer grace."*SITI September 2, 1886, page 534.6*

"Therefore, I cannot spare the law one moment, no more than I can spare Christ, seeing I now want it as much to keep me to Christ as I ever wanted it to bring me to him. Otherwise, this 'evil heart of unbelief' would immediately 'depart from the living God.' Indeed, each is continually sending me to the other,-the law of Christ, and Christ to the law. On the one hand, the height and depth of the law constrain me to fly to the love of God in Christ; on the other, the love of God in Christ endears the law to me 'above gold or precious stones.'"*-Sermon 34, "Properties of the Law."SITI September 2, 1886, page 534.7*

The above view of the law is a just one. But all have not so clear an understanding of the law and the gospel as Wesley had. Since

some, following the lead of Dr. Clarke, have either confounded the moral law with the Levitical or ceremonial, or else have supposed that the third of Galatians refers principally to the ceremonial law, it may not be amiss to show briefly why it is impossible that the ceremonial law should be the subject of discourse in that chapter. A few points will suffice. *SITI September 2, 1886, page 534.8*

1. Paul says that “Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us.” *Verse 13*. Now (a) There was nothing in the ordinances of the ceremonial law to condemn any one. Condemnation could come only through violation of the ten commandments. The ceremonial law was the sum of the gospel ordinances in the Jewish age. And there was no curse in any way attached to it, any more than there is to the gospel. It certainly did not curse those who carried it out with a sincere heart; for such, like David, offered “sacrifices of joy;” and those who neglected it and thus showed their unbelief, were condemned by the moral law alone, because of their sins; as Christ said, “he that believeth not is condemned already.” (b) Even admitting that the ceremonial law had a curse connected with it, or was itself a curse, “we” never had any connection with that law, and consequently could not be redeemed from it. (c) The Galatians, to whom this epistle was personally addressed, were chiefly converts from among the heathen, and had never had any connection with the ceremonial law. Therefore, although Paul might properly tell them to keep clear of it, he could not say that they had been redeemed from it. (d) The result of Christ’s being made a curse for us is “that the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith.” And the blessing of Abraham comes on the Gentiles only as they are redeemed from iniquity,-the transgression of the moral law. *SITI September 2, 1886, page 534.9*

2. Therefore “the Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe.” *Galatians 3:22*. Only the moral law could conclude men “under the sin.” There was nothing in the rites and ceremonies of the Levitical law that was of primary obligation,-nothing that could show men to be sinners. *SITI September 2, 1886, page 534.10*

3. "But before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed." *Galatians 3:23*. This is in no sense true of the ceremonial law. It did not precede faith, but followed it. No one ever heard of such a thing as the ceremonies of the Levitical law being performed by one who knew nothing of Christ. But it is true of all men that, before they have faith in Christ, they are "under the law," condemned, and "shut up" to the faith which may be revealed to them, as the only means of freedom from condemnation. *SITI September 2, 1886, page 534.11*

4. "Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith." *Galatians 3:24*. By no possibility can this refer to the ceremonial law. This text is sometimes read as though it said that the law was our schoolmaster to point us to Christ, and then it is asked, "What is there in the moral law that points to Christ?" The answer is, of course, that there is nothing. But the text says the law brings us to Christ. We have shown how the moral law does this, by giving the convicted sinner no rest until he flees to Christ. The ceremonial law, however, brought no one to Christ. It was simply the means by which those who already believed in Christ as the one who should be offered for sin, might indicate their faith in him. The ceremonial law comprised the gospel ordinances of the Jewish age. The order was, first the moral law to convict of sin and show the necessity for Christ, and then the rites of the ceremonial law to indicate and keep alive the faith that they already had. See *Leviticus 4*, noting especially *verses 2, 13, and 27*. Justification has reference only to the moral law. From the transgression of that, man needs justification; but the law cannot justify any sinner, it can only condemn. And so it drives him to Christ, that he may be justified by faith. *SITI September 2, 1886, page 534.12*

"But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster." *Galatians 3:25*. But it was only after faith came that people had anything to do with the ceremonial law. Is there a man in this age who has more faith than Moses, or David, or Isaiah, or Jeremiah, or Daniel, who all prophesied of Christ, and who looked to him for salvation? Those men "through faith subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions, quenched the violence of fire, escaped the edge of the sword,

out of weakness were made strong, waxed valiant in fight, turned to flight the armies of the aliens.” *Hebrews 11:33, 34*. And yet all their lives long they performed the rites of the ceremonial law. If *Galatians 3:25* refers to the ceremonial law, those faithful men ought never to have offered one of the sacrifices of that law. It was their faith, however, that led them to offer the sacrifices of the ceremonial law, as Paul says, “By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain.” *Hebrews 11:4*. *SITI September 2, 1886, page 534.13*

“The law was our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ, that we might be justified by faith.” *Galatians 3:24*. The past tense can be used here only by those who have come to Christ and have been justified by faith, as Paul shows in the next verse. Since the law was our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ, it must still be the schoolmaster (pedagogue) to those who are not in Christ, and must retain that office until every one who will accept Christ is brought to him. Therefore the law will be a schoolmaster to bring men to Christ, as long as probation lasts. But the Levitical law passed away hundreds of years ago; therefore it cannot be the law referred to here. To put the matter briefly, we may say that if the law is a schoolmaster to bring men to Christ, to divest it of that office while there are men still out of Christ, yet willing to come to him, would be to prematurely cut them off from hope of salvation. *SITI September 2, 1886, page 534.14*

We would by no means be understood as holding that the ceremonial law does not figure in the epistle to the Galatians. The controversy over the ceremonial law drew out the epistle. But there was in that controversy, which this epistle must have effectually settled for all candid minds, something deeper than the mere question whether or not men should be circumcised. Paul repeatedly asserts that it makes no difference whether or not a man is circumcised. “Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing.” But when men submitted to it as a means of justification, that moment it became a serious matter, for such an act is a rejection of Christ. *SITI September 2, 1886, page 534.15*

Suppose a man has accepted Christ and in him has been made “a new creature.” Now suppose that he is led to accept circumcision,

or any other work, as a means of justification, thereby rejecting Christ; what will be the immediate result? He will at once go into sin; for out of Christ no man can by any possibility refrain from sinning. No matter to what heights of holiness a man may have attained, just as soon as he loses sight of Christ as his “wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption,” he becomes carnal and cannot please God. This was the case with the Galatian brethren. They had been called into the grace of Christ; but some had troubled them with another gospel—a gospel of works and not of faith—which was no gospel at all, and by accepting it they had lost their faith in Christ, and consequently had become sinners “under the law.” And it is on this account that the apostle exclaims, “O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you, that ye should not obey the truth (Compare *Psalms* 119:142, 151), before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth, crucified among you?” (*Galatians* 3:19) and again, “Ye did run well; who did hinder you that ye should not obey the truth?” *Galatians* 5:7. *SITI September 2, 1886, page 534.16*

But this is sufficient. We did not design to discuss the whole book of Galatians, but simply to show that it gives no comfort to the enemies of the law of God. We wish the reader to keep in view the main thought in our study,—that God desires that all men should be saved. His love is as boundless as the universe, and reaches to the least of his creatures. But he cannot endure it in his presence. Neither could the sinner be happy in the presence of the pure and holy God. Nay, more, it would be impossible for the sinner even to look upon God. Everything that dwells with God must be in perfect accord with him. But all men have violated his holy law, and are by it condemned to death. God has a glorious inheritance promised to the righteous, but who can obtain it? No one can make himself righteous. The sinner studies the law, and learns what sort of a character he ought to have, but that only condemns him the more. It provides no way of escape, but drives him toward the door of mercy, which is ever open. Then, instead of profitless struggles, being justified by faith he has peace with God, through our Lord Jesus Christ. Thus the law proves to be the strongest ally of the promise by faith. And this tutorship it exercises until the Seed comes to whom and through whom the promise was made, and then God’s people being all righteous, it ceases to drive them. They

are “in Christ,” and the law is in their hearts. In Christ they find everything. No need have they now to teach one another the way of truth, because the truth, is in their hearts. More than this, they are all taught of God, and their peace is like a river, constantly flowing. Fully reconciled to God, they see his face, and in his presence find fullness of joy, and at his right hand enjoy pleasures forevermore. *SITI September 2, 1886, page 535.1*

Reader, “now is the accepted time: now is the day of salvation.” “To-day, if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts.” “The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God;” but if with sincerity you pray with the psalmist, “Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me,” he will for Christ’s sake pardon all your iniquity, and then, being a new creature in Christ, you can say, “O how love I thy law! it is my meditation all the day.” *Psalms 119:97. W.SITI September 2, 1886, page 535.2*

“The Only Sure Guide” The Signs of the Times, 12, 34.

E. J. Waggoner

Says the apostle Peter: “We have also a more sure word of prophecy; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light that shineth in a dark place, until the day dawn, and the day star arise in your hearts.” *2 Peter 1:19*. What does he mean by saying that we have a “*more sure* word of prophecy”? Does he mean that we have one word of prophecy that is more sure than some other word of prophecy? By no means, “for the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man; but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost” (*verse 21*), and therefore it is all equally true. But the apostle has just before related the experience of the apostles with Christ in the mount of transfiguration, when they saw Christ in the glory which he will have when he comes again to earth, and they heard the voice of God saying, “This is my beloved Son.” The apostles were treated to a miniature representation of the coming of the Lord, and so Peter assures the brethren that he had been an eye-witness of the things which he made known to them. But, nevertheless, says he, “We have a more sure word of prophecy?” That is, the testimony of prophecy is more sure than the evidence of our senses. Therefore we must believe the prophecy,

even though it is directly contrary to the evidence of our senses. He who thus accepts the Bible can never be deceived, while the one who trusts even his own senses in preference to the Bible will sooner or later surely be led into fatal error. *SITI September 2, 1886, page 535.3*

“Feeding upon Christ” The Signs of the Times, 12, 34.

E. J. Waggoner

A friend asks what is meant by eating the flesh and drinking the blood of Christ (*John 6:53-57*), and wishes to know if it has any connection with the bread and wine of the Lord’s Supper. In reply we would say that it evidently has the closest connection. Christ said: “Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him.” *John 6:53-56*. Now is evident that no man can literally eat the flesh and drink the blood of Christ, and this caused the unbelieving to choose to stumble. But Christ meant that by faith we should appropriate him to ourselves, and thus live godly lives for him, just as one lives physically by what he eats. Says Paul: “I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me.” *Galatians 2:20*. So Christ continues: “As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father; so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me.” *John 6:57*. It is by faith that we have that close communion with Christ which enables us to live as he himself would live; for “the just shall live by faith.” *SITI September 2, 1886, page 535.4*

The Lord’s Supper is the visible manifestation of this faith which thus appropriates Christ. When Christ broke bread, he said, “This is my body, which is broken for you.” Then he took the cup and said, “This cup is the new testament in my blood: for, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me.” *1 Corinthians 11:24, 25*. And Paul immediately adds: “For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup ye do showed the Lord’s death.” *Verse 26*. It is in the death of

Christ, and our death and burial with him, that we are united to him. It is only in his *broken* body that we partake. And in partaking of the bread and the wine of the Lord's Supper, we are fulfilling *John 6:53-57* as literally as it is possible for us to fulfill it. Of course this is true only so far as the Lord's Supper is partaken of understandingly, and not as a mere form. He who partakes of it as a mere matter of form, not discerning with the eye faith, the Lord's body, eats and drinks damnation to itself. Such a person does not eat the flesh and drink the blood of Christ, but eats and drinks simply bread and wine, and of course does not comply with the divine command. *SITI September 2, 1886, page 535.5*

Let no one, however, imagine that Christ's words in *John 6:53-57* can be fulfilled only when the Lord's Supper is eaten. If the Christian is to live by Christ, and he can live in no other way, he must continually feed on Christ. A man cannot live a year, a month, or even a week without spiritual food anymore than he can live and grow physically without daily partaking of literal food. The true Christian *abides* in Christ, and Christ *abides* in him; there is daily and hourly communion. He does not receive Christ on a fixed or varying occasions, but Christ *dwells* in him; and so when he partakes of the Lord's Supper, he indicates outwardly that union which always exists, and by that act his union by faith is strengthened. And thus living by Christ who lives by the Father, the Christian becomes "filled with all the fullness of God." *W.SITI September 2, 1886, page 535.6*

September 9, 1886

“Their Wisdom Is Perished” *The Signs of the Times*, 12, 35.

E. J. Waggoner

The subject of the International Sunday-school lesson for August 15 was “Christ Teaching Humility,” the text being *John 13:1-17*. We do not design in this article to consider in detail the subject of feet-washing as a Christian ordinance, for that ground was thoroughly canvassed in the “Notes” in the SIGNS of that week; but we wish to call attention to some of the “expositions” of the text that are given in the various religious journals. *SITI September 9, 1886, page 550.1*

First we pickup the *Christian Union*. It says on *verses 12-16*:-*SITI September 9, 1886, page 550.2*

“Feet-washing seems here to be as explicitly commanded as the Lord’s Supper. Yet there is no evidence that it was practiced in apostolic times, nor is in general use in the Christian church to-day. It is practiced in some Greek convents, by the Pope once a year on Maundy Thursday, and by some minor Baptist sects, chiefly confined to Pennsylvania. This apparent regard of Christ’s seemingly explicit command can be defended only on the general ground that no ceremonial is of the essence of Christianity; that what Christ prescribes is not the symbol, but the spirit symbolized.” *SITI September 9, 1886, page 550.3*

Then we think it would be well for “the Christian church” to learn the meaning of these words which are found in this connection: “The servant is not greater than his Lord; neither he that is sent greater than he that sent him.” If Christ gave it an explicit command (as he did in this instance), and “the church” has taken it upon itself to decide that compliance with that command is not necessary, then certainly the servant has, in his own estimation, got quite a distance above his Lord. *SITI September 9, 1886, page 550.4*

“No ceremonial is of the essence of Christianity.” Very true; but that is no reason for disregarding the ceremony if it is commanded. We

should not refuse to follow certain ordinances because those ordinances may be performed in a mechanical matter, but should see to it that we perform them with the spirit. We all know that love is shown by obedience to the expressed wishes of another. We also know that a child may mechanically or from necessity obey any given command, and that then the obedience indicates no love. That is, love is manifest, not by the mere performance of the act, but by the spirit with which that act is performed. Now recognizing this fact, a boy will say, "It seems quite plain that my father told me to care for this garden; but since the essence of love and obedience is not in any form, nor in outward acts of obedience, I will pay no attention to what he said, but will be sure to have a strong *feeling* of love in my heart." The father would quickly decide that such a son was too "progressive." *SITI September 9, 1886, page 550.5*

It is not true that feet-washing was not practiced in apostolic times, as is shown by *1 Timothy 5:10*. But even if the Saviour's command had never been obeyed, that would not be the shadow of a reason why we should not obey it. *SITI September 9, 1886, page 550.6*

Next we pick up the *Methodist Recorder*. On *verse 14* it has the following: *-SITI September 9, 1886, page 550.7*

"The command will rather find its fulfillment in all kinds of mutual condescension and help than any literal observance." *-Alford. SITI September 9, 1886, page 550.8*

Oh, yes; that settles the matter. Mr. Alford's *dictum* is sufficient. To be sure Christ said, "Ye also ought to wash one another's feet," but Dean Alford says that he didn't mean what he said, and so we need not trouble ourselves over the matter any more. This is a sample of the pernicious use of commentaries, and of the perniciousness of nineteenth of the comments that are written. When a man gives a scholarly criticism of the meaning of some terms in the original, or when he compares several texts bearing on one point, and shows the necessary conclusion therefrom, -that is legitimate comment; but when he ventures to give his own *opinion* of a text, unsupported by any authority, it were better for that matter if he had never written a commentary; and people who implicitly trust any commentator who will even once give his own *opinion* as to the meaning of a text, are

willingly walking into darkness.*SITI September 9, 1886, page 550.9*

The *Christian at Work* has a comment very similar to that of the *Christian Union*. It says:-*SITI September 9, 1886, page 550.10*

“Finally the application of the entire transaction comes out in the words: ‘If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, ye also ought to wash one another’s feet.’ This is not to be literally understood; for neither the apostles nor the members of the early church, though acting under the direction of the Spirit, ever actually practiced feet-washing as a religious rite.”*SITI September 9, 1886, page 550.11*

To this we would say, (1) That because a public record of the performance of an act is not kept, that is no evidence that the act was not done. The thing having been commanded, we naturally conclude that it was practiced, except when the church was not led by the Spirit; for obedience to known requirement is an evidence of being led by the Spirit. (2) In *1 Timothy 2:10*, feet-washing is mentioned by Paul as a well-known Christian duty, and one entirely distinct from acts of hospitality and relieving the afflicted. (3) Obligation to perform any deed can rest only on an expressed commandment, and not on the action of any other persons. When a thing is commanded, it is our duty to do it, even if everybody else disregards it.*SITI September 9, 1886, page 550.12*

But the *Christian at Work* overthrows its own theory when it says concerning the Saviour’s command:-*SITI September 9, 1886, page 550.13*

“It means that as the Lord found it not inconsistent with the highest dignity and glory to minister in all lowliness unto the weakest, so we must find exaltation and happiness by doing likewise.”*SITI September 9, 1886, page 550.14*

Just above it said that feet-washing is not to be practiced, because (as it claims) the apostles and the members of the early church did not do so. Then by the same “reasoning,” ministering unto the weak and lowly is not to be done unless “the church” in all ages has done so. Now the veriest tyro in history knows that the great apostasy began in the very days of the apostles, when there were many in

the church who loved to have the pre-eminence, and that for hundreds of years the members of the church, instead of finding exaltation and happiness in serving the weak, found it in building themselves up at the expense of others. And so according to the popular exposition of *John 13:1-16*, it is now every man's duty to look out for himself, regardless of others. When one begins to "explain away" the Bible, he may as well throw it away. *SITI September 9, 1886, page 550.15*

The *Sabbath Recorder*, however, caps the climax of absurdity in the following extract:-*SITI September 9, 1886, page 550.16*

"In company with a traveling companion, we reached the house of another friend about noon, after a long journey on foot, under a hot sun, and over a dusty road. We had barely passed the customary greetings, and taken our seats in the best room, when the good woman of the house asked us to take off our boots. Seeing that we hesitated, she repeated her request in a manner which plainly showed that she was not joking. We accordingly took them off, and she took them out of the room. Presently she returned them as neatly blackened as they had been for some time. When she set them down she said, 'And thus I have fulfilled my Lord's command to wash the disciples' feet.' And who shall say that she had not done so?" *SITI September 9, 1886, page 550.17*

Everybody ought to say that she did not. In the first place, even if our Saviour's command had reference only to acts of hospitality, it would not be fulfilled by performing such acts and then calling attention to it. True hospitality, as well as true obedience, is unostentatious. But the idea of saying that for one person to black another's boots is a fulfillment of our Lord's word, "Ye also ought to wash one another's feet," is too absurd for serious comment. According to this exposition, the Saviour's words should be read thus: "If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, ye also ought to black one another's boots! For I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you." The simple statement of the case refutes it. Besides, the reader will notice that the act of feet-washing is to be reciprocal: "Ye also ought to wash one another's feet." Now allowing that to wash feet means to black boots, in order to have the command fulfilled in the case under

consideration, the editor of the *Recorder* ought to have turned around and blacked the good woman's shoes. *SITI September 9, 1886, page 550.18*

The very absurdity of such an exposition as the above is, after all, the most serious thing about it; for it is sad to think that men will thus sport with a divine command. It is nothing less than making void the commandments of God. On the same principle men rest on Sunday, and say that they are thus obeying the Lord's command to "Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy." With as much reason others are sprinkled with a few drops of water, and say that they are obeying the injunction to be baptized. On such a principle of interpretation there is no conceivable act that may not be construed into obedience to some divine command. *SITI September 9, 1886, page 550.19*

It is sad to think that because of such deviations of plain precepts, men are losing their power to comprehend the simplest truth; but so it is. The Lord says: "Forasmuch as this people draw near me with their mouth, and with their lips do honour me, but have removed their heart far from me, and their fear toward me is taught by the precept of men; therefore, behold, I will proceed to do a marvellous work among this people, even a marvellous work and a wonder; for the wisdom of their wise men shall perish, and the understanding of their prudent men shall be hid." *Isaiah 29:13, 14*. When a wise man turns aside from the plain commandments of the Lord, he becomes the most dangerous of counselors. W. *SITI September 9, 1886, page 550.20*

"Who Is Worthy?" The Signs of the Times, 12, 35.

E. J. Waggoner

W. D. C. asks: "When will *Matthew 25:31-46* be fulfilled? Are 'my brethren' (*verse 40*) a third class distinct from the sheep and the goats? It seems as if those who have heard the gospel would not be so surprised at the words of Christ." *SITI September 9, 1886, page 550.21*

A reading of the text itself should suffice to answer the question.

“When the Son of man shall, in his glory, and all the holy angels with him,” can be nothing but the glorious second advent of Christ, when “he shall send his angels with a great sound of the trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one into heaven to the other” (*Matthew 24:31*); when “he shall reward every man according to his works.” *Matthew 16:27*. At that time, as now, there will be but two classes,—the righteous and the wicked. A reading of the passage will show, that those on the right hand are the righteous, and that those on the left, the goats, are of the wicked. There is not now, nor will there ever be, any class between these two; if a man is not good, he is bad: there can be no middle ground. Says Christ: “He that is not with me is against me; and he that gathereth not with me scattereth abroad.” *Matthew 12:30*. *SITI September 9, 1886, page 550.22*

Now as to the question of surprise which the righteous ask, *verses 37-39*, we see nothing in it to indicate that those who ask it have never heard the gospel. Humility is the characteristic of the Christian. If they have learned of Jesus, who is meek and lowly of heart, they will be very unconscious of their own worthiness. There will be no spirit of boasting. If they should say, “Yes, Lord, we know that we have done all these things; we have served you faithfully,” that would be an indication that they had heard the gospel and vain. See *Matthew 7:22, 23*. But no such spirit will exist among those who are really Christ’s. No one will think of proclaiming his own worthiness, because, as a matter of fact, no one will have any worthiness of his own, but will be “complete in him, who is the head of all principality in power.” *Colossians 2:10*. And so instead of thinking of themselves, or claiming anything because of their own merit, the redeemed will with one accord unite in saying, “*Worthy is a Lamb* that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing.” *SITI September 9, 1886, page 550.23*

“Camp-Meeting in Santa Barbara County” The Signs of the Times, 12, 35.

E. J. Waggoner

This meeting, the third of the kind that has been held in the State this season, was held at Santa Maria, just within the north boundary

line of Santa Barbara County. The camp was located in a eucalyptus grove close by the village, and was a pleasant place to see. Its arrangements, as well as the uniform quiet on the grounds, and the promptness and order with which everything was conducted, called forth many expressions of surprise and admiration from all who attended either as campers or as a transient visitors. Many had supposed that camp-meetings were always scenes of disorder and confusion; they seemed surprised to learn that people can worship God in a house of cotton with as much decorum and reverence as they can in a house of wood.*SITI September 9, 1886, page 551.1*

The attendance, both of our own people and others, was small. The time of the camp-meeting was a little unfortunate, it being a time when nearly everybody was engaged in threshing. This, of course, was sufficient reason for the limited transient attendance; and the fact that our brethren in that section have newly come to the faith, and could not realize the importance of a camp-meeting, will account for the absence of some of them. But we think that an impression was made on all who were present that will be lasting, and that will not be confined simply to them. Visitors who came out of a curiosity went away to sound the praises of a meeting where all was peace. Visitors who came out of curiosity went away to sound the praises of a meeting where all was peace and quiet; and some who were in the dark as to duty, went away rejoicing in the light of present truth. All seemed very grateful for the instruction given, and no one could doubt but that the souls of all were refreshed, as they testified of their increased knowledge of the love and mercy of God, and of their determination to press forward to new victories in the strength of that love.*SITI September 9, 1886, page 551.2*

The spirit of sacrifice manifested by those that came to the meeting was commendable, and will, we believe, bear fruit. From nearly one hundred miles south, and from an equal distance north, women and children rode in open wagons over mountain roads, camping out at night under their wagons, that they might be present. It is almost needless to add that they were present at the beginning of the meeting, and that they stayed until the close. This is not, however, meant as a reproach to those were present only a portion of the time. We are convinced that all made the strongest effort possible

under the circumstances.*SITI September 9, 1886, page 551.3*

The expenses of the meeting were promptly and cheerfully meet. As an item of encouragement we also note that the attention of many is being directed to the College, and that some from the southern countries will attend the coming term. We believe that our educational institutions were planted in the province of God, and that upon them largely depends the future of the young among us, as well as the general advancement of the cause. We believe that God designs them to wield an influence that has as yet scarcely been dreamed of but by few.*SITI September 9, 1886, page 551.4*

All left for their homes with good courage, with regrets that the meeting closed so soon, and with a determination that the next one should be more largely attended if their influence could do aught toward accomplishing that result. W.*SITI September 9, 1886, page 551.5*

September 16, 1886

“In the Law” The Signs of the Times, 12, 36.

E. J. Waggoner

The expression, “under the law,” occurs twelve times in King James’s version of the New Testament, in the following verses: *Romans 3:19; 6:14, 15; 1 Corinthians 9:20 (three times), 21; Galatians 3:23* (the equivalent expression “under a schoolmaster,” is found also, in *verse 24*); *4:4, 5, 21; 5:18*. In previous articles we have considered all these instances of the use of the term, except *Romans 3:19*, and *1 Corinthians 9:20, 21*. In every case thus far we have found that it indicates a state of sin, and consequently of condemnation by the law. The one who has violated the law is under sentence of death, and so the law is represented as being upon him, holding him down to death. *SITI September 16, 1886, page 566.1*

Now in *Romans 3:19*, a different thought is presented to one who reads the text carefully. We will read it: “Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them that are under the law; that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God.” On reading this some one will say, “Your idea that ‘under the law’ means condemned by the law certainly cannot hold here, for that would make the text of no force; it would be the same as saying, ‘What things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are condemned by the law, in order that every one may be condemned,’ and that would be nonsense.” The point is well taken, and we should have to conclude that the term “under the law” does not always indicate a state of sin and condemnation, if it were not for the fact that the expression does not really occur in *Romans 3:19* at all. In all the texts which we have heretofore considered, the Greek words which are rendered “under the law” are, *hupo nomon*, which should be rendered, as they invariably are, by the phrase “under the law.” But in *Romans 3:19* the Greek words which in King James’s version are rendered “under the law” are, *en to nomo*, which cannot properly be translated in any other way than “in the law.” The same expression is found in the Greek of *Romans 2:12*, where the translators have correctly rendered it “in the law.” *SITI*

September 16, 1886, page 566.2

The text under consideration should therefore read thus: "Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are in the law; that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before [margin, subject to the judgment of] God." That is, the law speaks to those who are within its jurisdiction, or, as Professor Boise renders it, "within its sphere," and as a consequence it declares that all the world are subject to the judgment of God, because it shows that all are sinners.*SITI September 16, 1886, page 566.3*

The expression, "that every mouth may be stopped," is very forcible. When a man is brought into court, and charged with any crime, he begins, through his counsel, to plead his own cause, and to try to establish his innocence. But sometimes the evidence of a man's guilt is so overwhelmingly clear that he has no defense to make; his mouth is stopped, and he is forced to acknowledge the justness of the charge against him. So the law of God speaks to those over whom it has jurisdiction, and charges them with sin; and the evidence is so clear that no one can speak a word in self-defense, but all the world stand condemned before God.*SITI September 16, 1886, page 566.4*

By this rendering of *Romans 3:19*, and it is the correct one, we are taught an important truth concerning the extent of the law's jurisdiction. Note these points: The law speaks only to those who are within its sphere; if any such have violated it, it condemns them, and it can condemn no others. The law has no power to condemn any who do not owe allegiance to it, or who are outside its pale. Now Paul has shown (*Romans 3:9-18*) that there is not a person on earth who has not sinned, and he therefore emphatically declares that the law, speaking only to those within its jurisdiction, stops *every mouth*, and condemns *the whole world*. There could be no more forcible way of saying that *every individual in the world* is amenable to the law of God. Jews and Gentiles are all in the same condemnation, because they are all within the pale of the law, and have all violated it.*SITI September 16, 1886, page 566.5*

Perhaps some may think that this makes a contradiction between

Romans 3:19 and *Romans 2:12*, but there is none. It is true that *Romans 2:12* speaks of those “without law” as distinct from those “in the law;” but those who are spoken of as without law, are also spoken of as having sinned, and we have already learned (1) That “sin is the transgression of the law,” and that “where no law is there is no transgression,” and (2) that Paul, in *verses 14, 15*, shows that these same ones who are in one sense without law, “show the work of the law written in their hearts,” and that they therefore do have the law. Some sin in the face of the full light of the law, while others sin against only that knowledge of the law which they have by nature; but all are counted as sinners in God’s sight, and they could not be so reckoned if they were not amenable to the law; hence he declares that all are in reality “in the law.” *SITI September 16, 1886, page 566.6*

Let us now read *1 Corinthians 9:20, 21*: “And unto the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews; to them that are under the law, as under the law, that I might gain them that are under the law; to them that are without law, as without law, (being not without law to God, but under the law to Christ) that I might gain them that are without law.” In this text the term, “under the law,” occurs four times. In the first three instances, reference to the same thing is made in each case. In the fourth instance, however, in *verse 21*, the Greek is *en to nomo*, as in *Romans 3:19*, and should be rendered “in the law.” Then the verse would read, “To them that are without law [I became] as without law, (being not without law, but *in* the law to Christ,) that I might gain them that are without law.” *SITI September 16, 1886, page 566.7*

In order to get the full force of this text, we must note the verse immediately preceding, and the two following: “For though I be free from all men, yet have I made myself servant unto all, that I might gain the more.” “To the weak become I as weak, that I might gain the weak; I am made all things to all men, that I might by all means save some. And this I do for the gospel’s sake, that I might be partaker thereof with you.” These verses, taken in connection with the 20th and 21st, show Paul’s meaning to be that in his ministerial work he sought to adapt himself, as far as possible, to the condition of those for whom he labored. He did not approach all men in the same manner, but adapted his teaching to the different classes of

people whom he taught. He took every one upon his own ground.*SITI September 16, 1886, page 566.8*

To the Jews, he became as a Jew. This he could easily do, for he was himself a Jew, and knew all their habits and customs. The book of Hebrews is an instance of how he became as a Jew to the Jews. From their own history, their Scriptures, and their religion, he demonstrated the Messiahship of our Saviour, and also his whole work in connection with the plan of salvation.*SITI September 16, 1886, page 566.9*

To them that were under the law, he became as under the law, that he might gain them that were under the law. That is, he drew on his own experience as a sinner, that he might successfully labor for those who felt the condemnation of God's law upon them in consequence of their sins. The seventh chapter of Romans is an instance of this. If Paul had not felt the terrible anguish which comes from the knowledge of an offended God, and the sense of impending doom, and the wondrous peace which comes from believing in Jesus, he could never have written a chapter so full of encouragement to the convicted sinner.*SITI September 16, 1886, page 566.10*

To them that were without law, that is, to the Gentiles who had not the written law, and the full knowledge of God, he became as without law, that he might gain them that were without the law. An instance of this is given in his dealing with the Athenians, *Acts 17:22-31*. He took them on their own ground, and from their own heathen worship, and their own heathen literature; he demonstrated to them the existence of a great Creator, and the certainty of a future general Judgment.*SITI September 16, 1886, page 566.11*

But while he became to them as without law, he says that he was in reality "not without law to God, but in the law to Christ." That is, he all the time recognized his obligation to keep the whole law of God, and that Christ was to him the end of that law for righteousness,-he did all things only by the aid of Christ.*SITI September 16, 1886, page 566.12*

This closes up the consideration of the expression "under the law." Taking out *1 Corinthians 9:21* and *Romans 3:19*, in which texts, as

we have seen, the term does not really occur, we can arrive at this positive conclusion, that in every instance of its occurrence, “under the law” indicates a state of sin and condemnation. And since it is everywhere stated that only those who are in Christ are free from the condemnation of the law, and that all who are not in Christ and have not his Spirit, are under the law, the fact that the law is still in active operation is everywhere demonstrated. W.*SITI September 16, 1886, page 566.13*

“The End Near” The Signs of the Times, 12, 36.

E. J. Waggoner

“How do you explain the many passages in the New Testament that speak as if the end was close at hand? *If* the translators got the hang of those passages, those who first read them *must* have understood that the day of the Lord was at hand. Can it be that they spoke only of the persecutions shortly become? or did they think the interval between the persecutions and the advent shorter than it proved to be?*SITI September 16, 1886, page 566.14*

“*1 Corinthians 7:29* seems to many to teach that the end was near; yet from *verse 26*, and from Dean Alford’s translation, I understand him [Paul] to mean that the time of trouble was near, and that he is not speaking of the end; but many texts, such as *Romans 13:14; 1 Corinthians 1:6-8; 1 Thessalonians 1:10; 1 Timothy 6:14; Hebrews 10:34, 36, 37; 1 Peter 4:17; Revelation 1:1, 3*, seem to teach those to whom they were written that the end would be in their day.” W. D. C.*SITI September 16, 1886, page 566.15*

1. As to the passages that speak of the coming of the Lord and the end of the world, we don’t explain them; we simply take them just as they read, and believe them. And we do not doubt but that the translators got the “hang” of those passages; in fact, we are glad to *know* that they got the correct idea of them, because we love the Lord and rejoice in the assurance that he is coming. We should be in a deplorable condition, indeed, if there were no passages in the Bible assuring us that the Lord is coming.*SITI September 16, 1886, page 566.16*

2. We cannot allow that the New Testament writers were deceived as to the coming of the Lord. If we could think that they were to the slightest degree mistaken on this point, we could not be sure that they were not mistaken on every point. We believe that the whole Bible was written by inspiration of God, that it is equally inspired, and all equally true. If they text seems to us doubtful, or difficult to be understood, we lay it to our own ignorance, and not to the ignorance of the holy men of God who wrote as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.*SITI September 16, 1886, page 566.17*

3. It is a fact that some of those to whom Paul wrote got the idea that the coming of the Lord was going to take place in their day. But they did not get it from Paul's sermons or letters. There were some who were attempting to *deceive* the brethren by a *pretended* epistle from Paul (See *2 Thessalonians 1:3*), and this led Paul to repeat what he had told them while he was with them,-that Christ would not come until after the Papacy had arisen, and had run its course of persecution and blasphemy. Certainly, then, we have no chance to be deceived, and suppose that the immediate coming of the Lord was preached in the first century; for although there are some passages which, taken alone, might seem to indicate that such was the case, we have the whole Bible, and are not obliged to take any one passage by itself. The Bible is one harmonious book. It was written by many men, but they all had the same Spirit, and so in every part it bears uniform testimony.*SITI September 16, 1886, page 566.18*

4. *1 Corinthians 7:29* does not say that the Lord's coming is at hand, and therefore we do not need to go to any commentary to find out that Paul was writing of the then "present distress." So that passage, with other similar ones, doubtless refers to impending persecutions, and all were so understood by those to whom they were addressed. The instruction, however, which they contain is directly applicable to those who live when the coming of the Lord is close at hand.*SITI September 16, 1886, page 567.1*

5. When the New Testament writers speak directly of the coming of the Lord, as in *1 Thessalonians 1:9, 10; Revelation 1:1, 3*, we have no right to suppose that they had reference to persecutions, or to anything but the coming of the Lord. The two texts to which we

have just referred may be taken as a sample of all. The first one reads thus: "For they themselves show of us what manner of entering in we had unto you, and how ye turned to God from idols to serve the living and true God; and to wait for his Son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead, even Jesus, which delivered us from the wrath to come." This brings to view the coming of the Lord as the Christians hope. Death is nowhere set forth as the object of the Christian's solicitude. The coming of the Lord is the blessed hope, the consummation of all things, and nothing else could be set before Christians of all ages to stimulate their energies. *SITI September 16, 1886, page 567.2*

As to such texts as *Revelation 1:1, 3*: "The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him, to show unto his servants things which must shortly come to pass; ... Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy, and keep those things which are written therein; for the time is at hand;" or *Revelation 22:20*: "He which testifieth these things saith, Surely I come quickly;" they were literally true when written. The things which John wrote did begin shortly to come to pass. More than that, it could truly be said that the Lord's coming was at hand. We must acknowledge this when we remember that the day of Pentecost was in "the last day" (See *Acts 2:16-21*), and that Paul wrote in the last days. *Hebrews 1:1, 2*. It was true then that the coming of the Lord was "at hand," although not *immediately* at hand; it is a thousand fold more true now. *SITI September 16, 1886, page 567.3*

6. Everything in the New Testament was spoken or written to individuals then living, and was applicable to them; but it is also applicable to us. Comprehensiveness is a characteristic of the words of inspiration. Yet many things have a more direct application to us than to them. Suppose that the Bible had been only partly written centuries ago, and that all reference to the mere coming of the Lord had been left to be written at the present time; what evidence would we have that it was a divine inspiration? If reference were made to certain signs already fulfilled, everybody would say that was conjecture. But the Saviour gave us ground for the firmest assurances of faith, when centuries ago he foretold his coming, and the signs which would indicate its nearness. The fact that those signs were then foretold, made it possible that any one

who accepted the words of inspiration *just as they are recorded*, should be deceived. Let us, then, not spend time in “doubtful disputations,” but let us believe that “yet a little while, and he that shall come will come, and will not tarry;” and “let us holdfast the profession of our faith without wavering; for he is faithful that promised.” W.*SITI* *September 16, 1886, page 567.4*

September 30, 1886

“How We May Know” The Signs of the Times, 12, 38.

E. J. Waggoner

Some people refuse to accept the Bible because there are so many things in it they cannot understand. If they could understand the Bible, they would accept it and Christ. Such need never expect to understand the Bible, for “the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.” *1 Corinthians 2:14*. If a man would understand the Bible, to begin with it is necessary for him to understand and believe, only these two simple verses: “For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.” *John 3:16*. “This is a faithful saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners; of whom I am chief.” *1 Timothy 1:15*. If he has mastered these two texts and all he has to do to master them is to believe them with his whole heart, then he is a child of God, by faith in Christ Jesus, and being in Christ, he has the Spirit of Christ, and may discern spiritual things. If he grows in the knowledge of Christ, he must necessarily grow in wisdom, for Christ is our wisdom as well as all or redemption. *1 Corinthians 1:30*. In Christ “are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge.” *Colossians 2:3*. Therefore in Christ we may obtain all wisdom, but out of him we must remain ignorant. So we say to all, if you wish to understand the Bible, confess your sins to God, accept the sacrifice which he has provided, and receive his pardon. There is no Biblical knowledge which is not possible to the thoroughly converted man. *SITI September 30, 1886, page 598.1*

“The Sabbath and Conversion” The Signs of the Times, 12, 38.

E. J. Waggoner

The following question and answer we find in the report of a “gospel service” in San Francisco on a recent Sunday night: *-SITI September 30, 1886, page 598.2*

"Is the Sabbath done away with?" *SITI September 30, 1886, page 598.3*

"If you are a Jew, No. But it is deplorable to see a person claiming to be a Christian, and going back to Judaism. The Sabbath is the seventh day, but they are not converted people who keep it. Some people devote so much attention to the Sabbath question that their religion is all Sabbath and no Christ." *SITI September 30, 1886, page 598.4*

That is, the thing is done and it is not done. We leave the question as to how a thing can at the same time both be and not be, to those who are more skilled in casuistry than we are. We read that "the Sabbath was made for man;" then if it is abolished, it must be abolished for man; and if it is not abolished, it must remain for man. We have great respect for the Jews, but we do not believe that they were any more entitled to be called men that we are; therefore we do not believe the Sabbath was made specially for them. The Sabbath was made for all who are included in the general term "man." If there are any people to whom the term "man" does will not apply, then perhaps the Sabbath was not made for them. Keeping the Sabbath is no more Jewish than is worshiping the true God, or refraining from blasphemy, murder, and adultery. Therefore to keep the Sabbath is not to go back to Judaism. *SITI September 30, 1886, page 598.5*

"The Sabbath is the seventh day, but they are not converted people who keep it." The seventh-day Sabbath is the Sabbath commanded in the law, and the psalmist says, "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul." *Psalms 19:7*. The law, including the Sabbath, is that which converts the soul, and brings it to Christ; now if a man, having come to Christ, rejects that which alone could bring him to Christ, he necessarily, in so doing, rejects Christ. Therefore to say that the Sabbath-keeper cannot be a converted man is unscriptural and false. *SITI September 30, 1886, page 598.6*

If the man had said that *not all* could keep the Sabbath are converted, we should be obliged to agree with him. Not all who profess to worshiped the true God, are converted. Not all who profess to accept Christ as their Saviour, are converted. Said

Christ: "Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works? And then will I profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity." *Matthew 7:22, 23*. But this does not prove that no one can be converted if he worships God or prophesies in the name of Christ. Yet we might as well say that it does as to say that a Sabbath-keeper cannot be converted. *SITI September 30, 1886, page 598.7*

Answers such as the one quoted above may satisfy those who "love to have it so;" but the fact that these questions are continually being asked, shows that people are thinking about the Sabbath; and in these investigations many will reject the foolishness of men, and will accept the word of the Lord which "endureth forever." *SITI September 30, 1886, page 598.8*

"The Pork Question Again" The Signs of the Times, 12, 38.

E. J. Waggoner

Some time ago we wrote a short article for the SIGNS in answer to a question concerning the use of swine's flesh. Shortly after, we gave an explanation of Peter's vision, in reply to one who gave that as divine authority for pork eating. In that we showed that God did not give Peter a vision for the purpose of teaching him that it was his duty to eat pork, but to teach him that he should call no *man* common. We also stated the fact that the distinction of clean and unclean beasts was not peculiar to the Levitical economy, but that it existed from the earliest ages, and that consequently the abolition of the ceremonial law had no effect upon the hog. As proof that the distinction of clean and unclean beasts existed before the Jewish age, we referred to *Genesis 7:2, 8; 8:20*. *SITI September 30, 1886, page 598.9*

A friend, however, takes exception to this, and claims that *Genesis 9:3* shows that there was no distinction, but that all beasts were alike good for food. That verse reads thus, "Every moving thing that liveth shall be meat for you; even as the green herb have I given you all things." Every moving thing that liveth would include not only the hog but rats, toads, lizards, bats, buzzards, porcupines,

centipedes, spiders, and scores of lesser vermin, which we think even our pork-loving friend would not wish to have included in his bill of fare. But our friend will say the text says, "Every moving thing that liveth shall be meat for you," and we are not at liberty to say that it does not mean what it says, even though it may appear unreasonable. It is true that we are not at liberty to put our construction on the text, but we must allow one text to explain another. *SITI September 30, 1886, page 598.10*

We often find that a comprehensive statement is made in one place, and that exceptions to it are noted in another. For instance we read in *Exodus 16:4*: "Then said the Lord unto Moses, Behold, I will rain bread from heaven for you; and the people shall go out and gather a certain rate every day." If we should confine our attention to this text we should suppose the people gathered manna seven days in the week, but in the *26th verse* we read: "Six days ye shall gather it; but on the seventh day, which is the Sabbath, and yet there shall be none." Now when we read *Exodus 16:4* we read it in the light of the other verse, and know that the Lord meant that they should gather manna every working day; so, likewise, when we read *Genesis 9:3*, we read it in the light of *Genesis 7:2, 8; Leviticus 11:7, 8; Isaiah 65:3, 5; 66:17*, and others, which say that certain animals, the swine among them, are unclean and unfit for food. Therefore we know that the Lord meant that he had given to Noah every living thing of clean beasts for meat, and Noah must certainly have so understood it. *SITI September 30, 1886, page 598.11*

Our friend brings up *Romans 14:2, 3, 14* as evidence that pork eating is allowable. But these texts have no reference whatever to the eating of pork. The question here as in *1 Corinthians 8* is concerning things offered to idols. There is no reason to suppose that the word meat means flesh simply; on the contrary, it must necessarily include fruits and grains as well, for these were offered to idols. Now the question was, Is it lawful to eat any food that has been dedicated to an idol? Paul declares that it is, but he would not make it a matter of dispute. If a brother newly come to the faith thought that to eat food that had been offered to an idol was a recognition of that idol, he should be permitted to abstain from it and select food that had not been so dedicated. Neither should those who knew that there was no harm in it cause the weak

brother to stumble by partaking of it. Almost all food which the heathen used was dedicated to their gods, so that Christians could scarcely have found anything to eat if it had been true that such a food was not lawful to be eaten. But Paul declared that an idol was nothing and that to dedicate food to it had no affect upon it, and so he said, "Whatsoever is sold in the shambles, that eat, asking no question for conscience' sake." *SITI September 30, 1886, page 598.12*

1 Corinthians 10:27 is quoted as proof that we are at liberty to eat anything and everything. That reads, "If any of them that believe not bid you to a feast, and ye be disposed to go; whatsoever is set before you, eat, asking no question for conscience sake." The next verse, however shows what is referred to for it says, "But if any man say unto you, This is offered in sacrifice unto idols, eat not for his sake that showed it, and for conscience sake: for the earth is the Lord's, and the fullness thereof." If the matter of pork eating had been under discussion it would not have been necessary to say, "asking no questions for conscience' sake," for the man could tell if the dish were pork without asking any questions; but he could not tell that food had been offered to idols, unless he should ask, and this Paul tells them not to do because it is of no consequence. *SITI September 30, 1886, page 598.13*

Again we read, "For every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving; for it is sanctified by the word of God and prayer." *1 Timothy 4:4, 5* this text is quoted in favor of pork eating, but like *Genesis 9:3* it is too comprehensive. There must be exceptions, for there are creatures whose flesh is unwholesome and poisonous. The fifth verse in this case deprives the pork eater of all the comfort which he seeks to draw from it, for no one can find where swine has been sanctified by the word of God. *SITI September 30, 1886, page 598.14*

One more text we must notice. Our friend quotes *Colossians 2:16, 17*, but what has already been said covers of this text. Paul is speaking here of the ceremonial law, and we have already seen that the distinction between clean and unclean animals was before the ceremonial law. All must admit that this distinction was made in the very beginning, for immediately after the fall sacrifices were

made to God, and no right-minded person could think that the sacrifice of a hog or other unclean animal would be acceptable to God, even if the Bible said nothing about it. Therefore the distinction of clean and unclean beasts could be no part of the shadow of which Christ is the body. But if our friend thinks that he can trace some connection between pork eating and the mystery of Christ, we should like to have him show it to us.*SITI September 30, 1886, page 598.15*

We have considered these texts at this length before an explanation of them was asked, and we wish to give the true sense of them. We still adhere to our belief that the eating of swine's flesh is forbidden by the word of God. We cannot believe that the Lord delights in what twenty-five hundred years ago he called an abomination. And we emphatically protest against such a low view of Christ's sacrifice as would lead to the supposition that it was made largely in order that men might be at liberty to eat whatever their perverted appetites might crave. W.*SITI September 30, 1886, page 599.1*

October 7, 1886

“American Romanism” The Signs of the Times, 12, 39.

E. J. Waggoner

The *Catholic Mirror* of September 18 contains a letter from Cardinal Gibbons, in which he announces to the clergy that Pope Leo XIII. has formulated certain prayers which are henceforth to be “said” after every Low Mass, instead of those now in use. Such is the *order* of the Pope. We do not know the nature of the prayers now declared to be out of date, nor why it is that they have lost their efficacy; but we have the text of the prayers which are now declared to be official, and we will favor our readers with them. The first is as follows:-*SITI October 7, 1886, page 614.1*

“O God, our refuge and our strength, graciously look upon thy people who cry to thee; and through the intercession of the glorious and Immaculate Virgin Mary, Mother of God, of Blessed Joseph, her Spouse, and of thy holy Apostles, Peter and Paul, and all the saints, in thy mercy and kindness hear the prayers which we pour forth for the conversion of sinners, and for the freedom and exaltation of Holy Mother the Church. Christ our Lord, Amen.”*SITI October 7, 1886, page 614.2*

The reader will notice that in this prayer Christ is not altogether ignored. After “the faithful” have implored the intercession of Mary, Joseph, Peter and Paul, “and all the saints,” they are permitted to close with a reference to the name of Christ. It requires no great discernment to see that among Catholics the name of Christ is not considered to be “above every name.”*SITI October 7, 1886, page 614.3*

The second prayer is as follows:-*SITI October 7, 1886, page 614.4*

“Holy Michael, the Archangel, defend us in the battle; for our protection against the wickedness and snares of the devil. Rebuke him, O God, we suppliantly beseech thee; and do thou, O Prince of the heavenly host, by the divine power drive into hell Satan and the other evil spirits who wander through the world seeking the ruin of

souls. Amen.”*SITI October 7, 1886, page 614.5*

Among the “other evil spirits” who are thus charitably consigned to hell are, of course, all those who oppose the Catholic Church; for “the Church” regards all souls as ruined, who reject her dogmas and ceremonies. The two prayers, taken together, coming as they do from the Pope himself, afford a fair view of Catholicism at its best. But this is not all. The Cardinal closes with the following announcement:-*SITI October 7, 1886, page 614.6*

“His Holiness Pope Leo XIII. grants to all who recite these prayers, as aforesaid 360 days’ indulgence.”*SITI October 7, 1886, page 614.7*

Here we have the veritable antichrist itself revealed. The granting of indulgences fitly accompanies the rejection of Christ as sole Mediator. Here we find the Pope promulgating, as a matter of course, the very things which aroused the holy zeal of Luther, and against which the Reformation was directed; yet to-day not one Protestant in ten thousand will give the matter a second thought. Professed Protestants now regarded Catholicism as a “branch” or grand division of the Christian Church, and the National Reformers urge the necessity of courting its favor, and even of submitting to repeated rebuffs if in the end they can but secure the alliance of the Catholic Church. When we consider the increased civilized population of the world in the last four hundred years, we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that Rome have already more than regained that which she lost by the Reformation. We think we are warranted in drawing the following conclusions:-*SITI October 7, 1886, page 614.8*

1. The Roman Catholic Church is the same to-day that it was four hundred years ago. The general diffusion of knowledge has changed her tactics, but she still works for the same ends as then and secures them. What she accomplished then by force, she now gains by flattery. But her doctrines and principles have not changed in the least, and she is just as ready to use force now, when she can, as she was then.*SITI October 7, 1886, page 614.9*

2. Protestantism is now little more than a name. “Protestants” as a class have ceased to “protest.” They are content with the

knowledge of the fact that they are the descendants of those who did protest, and they view with indifference the rapidity with which the Church of Rome is extending its conquest of the world.*SITI October 7, 1886, page 614.10*

3. This indifference must arise from the fact that "Protestantism" so-called, has degenerated until it is very like Catholicism. If men were actuated by the spirit of the Reformers, they would as strongly protest against the evils of the "the church" to-day, as those noble men did. The Reformation has been deformed and that which the reformers regarded as the enemy of the truth, their children are ready to embrace as the conservator of truth. Since "Rome never changes," Protestantism must have changed, in order to bring about the state of things.*SITI October 7, 1886, page 614.11*

4. "National Reform" is Romanism under a different title. The Reformers withdrew from Rome, because Rome and they were antagonistic. If there had been oneness of thought and purpose, instead of antagonism, they would not have separated from Rome. But National Reformers are now seeking an alliance with Rome, and so anxious are they for this alliance, that they are determined to press their suit even though they may be repeatedly rejected. If the separation of the true Reformers from Rome indicated their antagonism to her, certainly the desired union of the National Reformers indicates their likeness to her.*SITI October 7, 1886, page 614.12*

5. If professed Protestants are so nearly like the Catholics that they cannot see any menace to the liberty of our country in the insidious advances of the Papacy; and if a degenerate Protestantism is anxious to ally itself with Catholicism, that both "branches" of "the church may be" thereby strengthened, then when this degenerate Protestantism, under the name of "National Reform," shall have succeeded in its purposes, it will certainly adopt the *tactics*, as it already has the *principles*, of Rome, and will not scruple to persecute those who cannot be won to its support by milder measures. Indeed, the National Reformers themselves concede this point, for Mr. Sommerville, in the *Christian Nation*, says that it is most certainly right "to take public money to teach principles, enforce laws, and introduce customs to which many members of

the committee are conscientiously opposed.” Papal Rome, in her highest period of exaltation, never did more than this. When a Government or power of any kind *enforces* laws and customs against the conscientious convictions of upright citizens, it is persecution for conscience’ sake. The National Reformers make no secret of their adherence to principles like this. *SITI October 7, 1886, page 614.13*

Therefore we say that when national reformers shall have succeeded in their designs, they will have nothing other than an exact image of the Papacy. Scripture is not silent upon this point. The leopard beast of *Revelation 13:1-8* is quite generally admitted to represent the Papacy; if any doubt this, their doubts may easily be silenced by the most convincing proof. The power brought to view it in the verses following is said to “make an image” to this papal beast, and that image we now see in process of construction. Once men predicted from this prophecy just such an image to the Papacy, in this country; now they do not need to refer to the prophecy to be aware of the fact. It certainly is time, all who value civil and religious liberty to sound the alarm. And the urgent necessity of warning the people against the adoption of papal principles, whether under the name of Romanism or National Reform, is made still more evident by the following announcement of divine wrath upon all who take any part in such iniquitous alliances:-*SITI October 7, 1886, page 614.14*

“And the third angel followed them, saying with a loud voice, If any man worship the beast and his image, and receive his mark in his forehead, or in his hand, the same shall drink of the wine of the wrath of God, which is poured out without mixture into the cup of his indignation; and he shall be tormented with fire and brimstone in the presence of the holy angels, and in the presence of the Lamb; and the smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever; and they have no rest day nor night, who worship the beast and his image, and whosoever receiveth the mark of his name.” *Revelation 14:9-11. W.SITI October 7, 1886, page 614.15*

October 21, 1886

“Abominable Prayers” *The Signs of the Times*, 12, 40.

E. J. Waggoner

In the *Sunday School Times* we find, in answer to a question asked by a correspondent, a little story which we think aptly illustrates the heading of this article. The incident is thus related by the *Times*:-*SITI October 21, 1886, page 630.1*

“A story is told of a New England deacon, who was visited by a committee of the church, in view of his drinking habit. He met the visitors cordially, and said, in substance: ‘I’ve asked the Lord’s help in this thing, and I’ve left the case with him. I was afraid I was drinking too much; so I prayed that, if I was in any danger of that, the Lord would take away my love for liquor. But my liking for it holds good, and so I know the Lord approves my drinking.’”*SITI October 21, 1886, page 630.2*

We think all will allow that such a prayer was little, if any, less than insult to God. The Bible declares God’s hatred of drinking habits, when it says that no drunkard shall enter the kingdom of Heaven. A drunkard is one who drinks immoderately; and this man was a drunkard, for he was drinking so much that he was getting alarmed at himself. Then why should he pray for wisdom concerning a thing that is plainly revealed? He knew he was doing wrong; he did not want to stop, and so he made conditions for the Lord, and because those conditions were such that the Lord could not comply with them, his conscience was satisfied. He had his mind made up beforehand what he should do, and might better have gone ahead without the mockery of prayer; the prayer was simply a taking of God’s name in vain, and could not be other than an abomination to the Lord.*SITI October 21, 1886, page 630.3*

We think no one will disagree with our conclusion on *this* matter; and yet there are hundreds, perhaps thousands, who are insulting the Lord in the same manner that the drinking deacon did, yet they cannot see the similarity, because the subject of their prayers is different. We have often heard people say, in substance: “I know

that the ten commandments are God's and unchangeable laws, and that the fourth commandment requires the observance of the seventh day, and of no other. I know that the Bible does not sanction the observance of Sunday. There was a time when I was considerably troubled over this matter-whether I ought not to keep the Sabbath instead of Sunday. So I prayed earnestly to the Lord that I might know my duty. I prayed that if it was wrong for me to keep Sunday, the Lord would let me know; and since then my mind has been perfectly at rest. I am in the Lord's hands; if he wants *me* to keep the Sabbath, he will let the know." *SITI October 21, 1886, page 630.4*

The least that we can say is, that such a prayer, offered under such circumstances, is an insult to the Lord. It is as though a child, knowing what his father had plainly and expressly commanded him to do, should turn right around and ask for some sign by which he might know that the father meant what he said. In such a case the reader can readily imagine what that "sign" would be. So God has given us explicit commands in his word. That word is all that he has given us for a guide in this life, and it is a sufficient guide, for it is able to make us wise unto salvation. That word is for a lamp to our feet, and a light to our path. Of the law of the Lord it is said that it "is perfect, converting the soul," and that to keep the commandments is "the whole duty of man." These commandments are very plain, so that any child can understand them, and now for anybody to pray to the Lord to know if it is to his duty to keep them, is an insult to the one who gave them. *SITI October 21, 1886, page 630.5*

The one who offers such a prayer virtually says: "I don't think the commandments of the Lord are sufficient guide for *me*; they may do for others, but I require something better." Or else he says: "I don't believe the Lord really means what he says." In either case, he turns away from the law, and treats it with contempt. Now does God hear the prayer of such? Hear what is said: "He that turneth away his ear from hearing the law, even his prayer shall be abomination." *Proverbs 28:9*. Then if the answer to such a prayer comes in the shape of peace to the one who persists in violating the commandment, who has answered it? Not God, for "he cannot deny himself." It must be none other it than the great adversary of the truth. *SITI October 21, 1886, page 630.6*

But will the Lord give any “sign” to such ones that he means what he says? Yes; numerous instances of this are given, but we will cite only one. Balaam was expressly told by the Lord not to go with the servants of Balak, to curse Israel. But he wanted to go, and so he asked the Lord if he really meant what he said. As a result, he became satisfied in his own mind that he might go, and he went. As a “sign” that the Lord meant what he said, Balaam was all but slain in the way, being saved only by his faithful beast, and was finally destroyed with the sword. *Numbers 31:8; 2 Peter 2:11, 12; Jude 11.SITI October 21, 1886, page 630.7*

And so all who seek for peace in a way contrary to the law of God, shall perish. “The man that wandereth out of the way of understanding shall remain in the congregation of the dead.” *Proverbs 21:16*. Paul, speaking of those who deliberately turn away from the only source of truth, and try to find peace in a way that God has not appointed, says that “God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie; that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness.” *2 Thessalonians 2:11, 12.SITI October 21, 1886, page 630.8*

Reader, do you want Satan, instead of the Lord, to answer your prayers? If not, then pray only in accordance with God’s word. Pray, as did David, “Open thou mine eyes that I may behold wonderous things out of thy law.” Such a prayer, offered in sincerity, God will not fail to answer. And when the Spirit makes known to us “the deep things of God,” and we delight in the law of the Lord, we have this precious promise: “If ye abide in me, and my words abide in you, ye shall ask what he will, and it shall be done unto you.” *John 15:7*. “Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be; but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is.” *1 John 3:22*. Let us never in our prayers take God’s name in vain. *W.SITI October 21, 1886, page 630.9*

“Real Knowledge” The Signs of the Times, 12, 40.

E. J. Waggoner

It is a very common thing to speak of the apostles with the exception of Paul, as uneducated and ignorant men. The enemies of the Bible think to disparage their testimony in this way, and many people who reverence the Bible unintentionally work to the same end by speaking of the apostles as ignorant. Only a short time since we read a statement from a minister, in which “the uneducated Peter” was spoken of. There is just one verse in the Bible which seems to give color to this idea, and that is *Acts 4:13*, which says that the council heard the boldness of Peter and John and perceived that they were unlearned and ignorant men. But this is an unfortunate translation. The word rendered “ignorant” means “private,” and the meaning is that the council saw that Peter and John, being Galileans, had not studied in their schools, and they marveled that private citizens who had not sat at the feet of the rabbis, and learned their fine-spun theories, should be able to talk with such power and wisdom.*SITI October 21, 1886, page 630.10*

If we consider for a moment who the apostles were, we shall see that it is a mistake to regard them as ignorant men. They were Jews, and every Jew was expected to give his child a knowledge of the law. The commandment found in *Deuteronomy 6:7*, “And thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house, and when thou walkest by the way, and when thou liest down, and when thou risest up,” was scrupulously obeyed by every pious Jew. Thus Paul says that Timothy had from a child known the Scriptures. Every Jew, no matter how humble his circumstances, had a knowledge of the law.*SITI October 21, 1886, page 630.11*

Now think what this implied. It meant that he had a knowledge of the Jewish people, and this comprised also a history of contemporary people. He would know as much about the creation and fall and other events of that time as it is possible for anyone to know. The history of the children of Israel in Egypt would make him familiar with the Egyptian people. He would also be familiar with the Assyrians and Babylonians and Persians and the Grecians, with all of from the Jews had been intimately associated. In short, the humblest Jew must have had a pretty good knowledge of the history of the world. Not only this, but in the Old Testament he would find literature which cannot be equaled in the world. In the

psalms and the prophets he would find the choicest poetry and the most sublime descriptions. The one who had made the Old Testament his daily study could not have failed to acquire a good use of language. In the colleges of the present-day young men are engaged for several years in studying the writings of the ancient Greek and Roman authors. They do not do this for the history with which those writings contain, for they could learn that in one-twentieth part of the time in their own language, but they engage in the study of the classics in order to discipline their minds, and to gain a good style of expression. All this may be gained from the study of the Bible, which, as is allowed even by infidels, contains the finest specimens of literature to be found in the world.*SITI October 21, 1886, page 630.12*

In addition to this knowledge, every Jew was required to give his child some trade by which he might be self-supporting; but the theoretical and the practical were combined. The apostles were not exceptions to this rule. They were practical men, able to transact business and to provide for themselves.*SITI October 21, 1886, page 630.13*

But all this was the least of their education. For three years and a half they had been in constant communication with Jesus. Day and night they had been with him, listening to his conversations and receiving instruction from him, and this was a schooling such as other men on earth ever enjoyed. If at the present day a young man could have as his tutor such a man as Dr. McCosh or some other learned professor, and could be with him constantly for three or four years, and could receive daily personal instruction from him, people would envy that young man as one who was having exceptional advantages. But the apostles had the greatest of all teachers, the Son of God himself, the One of whom even his enemies said, "Never man spake like this man." To be sure, the Pharisees spoke slightly even of him, saying, "How knoweth this man of letters, having never learned." In their selfish bigotry they thought that their schools, which were devoted to sophistry and vain philosophy furnished the sum of wisdom. But as we read the life of Christ we find that the most crafty and subtle and learned men were no match for him. Without any hesitation he answered their most perplexing questions, and always in the choicest and most direct

language.*SITI October 21, 1886, page 630.14*

In this school the apostles studied for three years and a half, until they had unconsciously by themselves acquired habits of thought and speech similar to his. Then they received the baptism of the Holy Ghost, which illuminated their minds and brought humbly to their remembrance all that they had previously learned. And so when they stood before the Jewish rulers, their enemies marveled that plain unassuming private citizens who had never attended the Rabbinical schools should be able to speak with such power and wisdom: "and they took knowledge of them that they had been with Jesus." In spite of their hatred to Jesus, the Pharisees knew that nowhere else could those men have received the education which they had. Surely the apostles were anything but uneducated men.*SITI October 21, 1886, page 631.1*

In this we may find a lesson that will be profitable to us. People are often heard complaining of their lack of advantages. They excuse themselves from responsibilities in connection with the cause of God, because they have no education. Many think that they are excusable for not having a thorough knowledge of the word of God, because in early life they had no educational privileges. But none are exempted from not knowing the things which God has revealed. All may have true wisdom. Says the psalmist, "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom; a good understanding have all they that do his commandments." *Psalms 111:10*. And this means just what it says. The one who studies the word of God with an honest, humble mind, will have wisdom which will be acknowledged even by the unbelieving world. Hear what Moses said to the Israelites:-*SITI October 21, 1886, page 631.2*

"Behold, I have taught you statutes and judgments, even as the Lord my God commanded me, that ye should do so in the land whither ye go to possess it. Keep therefore and do them; for this is your wisdom and your understanding in the sight of the nations, which shall hear all these statutes, and say, Surely this great nation is a wise and understanding people." *Deuteronomy 4:5, 6. SITI October 21, 1886, page 631.3*

From this we learn that it was not piety alone that the people were

to obtain from the study and practice of the word, for the world does not usually hold that in very high esteem; but in addition to piety they would have wisdom that would be acknowledged as such by worldly-wise men. We find the same thing exemplified to a high degree in the case of Solomon. When he was given his choice of what he would receive from the Lord, he said, "Give therefore thy servant an understanding heart to judge thy people, that I may discern between good and bad;" and the Lord said: "Because thou hast asked this thing.... behold, I have done according to thy word; lo, I have given thee a wise and an understanding heart; so that there was none like thee before thee, neither after thee shall any arise like unto thee." *1 Kings 3:9-12*. He who carefully studies the Proverbs of Solomon will be convinced that the Lord fulfilled his promise. All the wisdom of the world, and more too, is condensed in that one book. There is not a thing in human affairs, no business matter of any sort, that is not wisely treated of in the book of Proverbs. The man who makes that book his daily study, and profits by what he learns, will be wise in the sight of both God and man. Thus we profit by the blessing given to Solomon.*SITI October 21, 1886, page 631.4*

Leaving out the matter of inspiration,-the special illumination which the apostles had by the Spirit,-we have the same means of education that they had. We cannot see Jesus in the flesh, but we can nevertheless walk with him. In the Old Testament we have the Scriptures that the apostles had, and in the New Testament we have the words of Jesus to the apostles. If we make them our daily study, we may become imbued with their spirit. The Holy Spirit is given to all who ask for it in faith, for "the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him." In Christ are hid "the treasures of wisdom and knowledge." Why, then, if we have Christ, may we not have these treasures of wisdom and knowledge? We may if we *search* for them. We must not suppose that these treasures are to be received without our making any effort to obtain them. If treasures are hid in Christ, they can of course be found only by the one who has Christ; but since they are *hid*, even he must labor for them. There is no reason why the most obscure Christian should not be *uninformed* in all matters of which the Bible ...; and being thus informed, his judgment in temporal matters, must be improved. See *1 Corinthians 6:2, 3*. "If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of

God, that giveth to all men liberally, and upbraideth not; and it shall be given him." W. *SITI October 21, 1886, page 631.5*

"From the Woodland Camp-Meeting" The Signs of the Times, 12, 40.

E. J. Waggoner

We have been in camp ten days, but the time has not seemed half that long. Indeed, it seems as though the meetings began no longer ago than yesterday. With had beautiful weather until today, when we have had quite heavy showers; but as the meetings to-day have been most excellent, and there has been no complaining because of the rain, we may say that we have had the very best kind of weather for our camp-meeting. As the plain testimony has been given, and confession of sin has been made, God has shown his willingness to bless in an especial manner. From the first, the meetings have increased in interest, and there have been continued and increased evidences of the presence of the Spirit of God. We have not space on this last page to give anything like a full report of the meetings, even thus far; and as we do not want to spoil the full report that will appear next week, we can only say that the camp-meeting thus far has been good, better, best; and we expect that there is better yet to come. California has never before had so good a camp-meeting. To show that we speak within bounds, we will say that Elder Haskell, who has attended hundreds of camp-meetings, says that this one is the best that he is ever attended. To the Lord be all the praise. W. *Woodland, October 16. SITI October 21, 1886, page 640.1*

A later report still further vouches for the earnest spirit of the meeting but the announcement that *over one hundred thousands of dollars* had been pledged to various branches of the cause by Seventh-day Adventists. *SITI October 21, 1886, page 640.2*

"Back Page" The Signs of the Times, 12, 40.

E. J. Waggoner

A reader of the SIGNS asks: "Who was the author or creator of sin? Was it Satan or God? If it was God, the Creator of all things, how

does he vindicate his goodness? what motive had he for doing so?" *SITI October 21, 1886, page 640.3*

Christ said Satan: "When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own; for he is a liar, and the father of it." *John 8:44*. Everything that is right is true, and everything that is wrong is a lie. Therefore when Christ says that Satan is the father of lies, it is the same as saying that he is the father of all evil. God had nothing to do with originating sin. It is entirely out of harmony with his nature, for he is the embodiment of goodness and truth. He cannot lie. It would be an utter impossibility for him to do an evil thing. Whatever he does is right and just (*Psalm 111:7, 8*), because his ways are the standard of perfection and holiness. He does not have to vindicate his acts to mortals nor give a reason for them. Neither is any mortal required to vindicate the acts of God; they vindicate themselves. *SITI October 21, 1886, page 640.4*

As we have said, sin originated with Satan. It cannot be traced beyond him; but how it originated, or how it first sprung up in his heart, no one can tell, for sin is a mystery. See *2 Thessalonians 2:7*. A reason can be given for whatever can be explained, for to explain a thing is to give a reason for it. Now since sin would cease to be sin if an adequate reason for its existence could be given, it is evident that the origin of sin cannot be explained further than to say that it originated in the breast of Satan. *SITI October 21, 1886, page 640.5*

"I often crave to believe, and cannot," is what a man says of himself in an exchange. We don't believe a word of it. If a man wants to believe a thing he can. A man can make himself believe even the baldest lie ever invented. Certainly then, he ought to be able to believe truth which is supported by the most unimpeachable testimony. Such truth is that of the Bible concerning Christ and the gospel. If a man is not a believer, it is because he doesn't want to believe, he has a greater desire for something with which the truth is incompatible. Some people want to believe and they want Heaven, but they want this earth at the same time; and they can't have both. If a man really wants to serve the Lord, he will do it. "Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness, for they shall be filled." *SITI October 21, 1886, page 640.6*

Says the *Christian Union* in answer to a correspondent:-*SITI*
October 21, 1886, page 640.7

"If you wish to know the 'mode of baptism' in the New Testament times, there is little doubt that it was ordinarily, and perhaps always, performed by immersion. Whether this is conclusive as to the mode in which it should be performed in our time, is another question." *SITI* *October 21, 1886, page 640.8*

Ah, yes. There is no doubt but that in the New Testament times immersion was the only baptism, but then-that doesn't necessarily indicate that we should so consider it. But when it comes to Sunday, which the *Christian Union* admits was not in New Testament times considered as the Sabbath, why then-we ought to keep it anyway, out of respect for Christ and the apostles. Very strenuous that "apostolic example" should be followed when the apostles set no example, but when it is known that they certainly did do a certain thing, then do exactly contrary. Oh, for consistency!*SITI*
October 21, 1886, page 640.9

Esau deliberately sold his birthright for a mess of pottage. The Bible says that he "*despised* his birthright." All the brilliant possibilities that were in store for a wealthy prince of the East were counted as nothing compared with a paltry meal of victuals! We say, How could he be so foolish? He was not so near death but that he could have stood it a little longer without food. While he was bargaining with Jacob, he might have been preparing food for himself. The whole Bible-reading world has doubtless been united in condemning Esau for his foolishness. Yet there are thousands and tens of thousand of Esaus in the world to-day when a man says: "I know I ought to keep the Sabbath, but my business would be ruined if I should; I can't do it," he is trading Heaven and all its joys for a portion of this world, which he has no assurance of holding for a minute. He virtually says that an eternity of heavenly bliss is not worth so much in his estimation as a few years of earthly trouble. He despises the heavenly inheritance. How can such a one speak lightly of Esau?*SITI* *October 21, 1886, page 640.10*

One of the most common objections against keeping the Sabbath of the Lord is this: "If I should keep the seventh day of a week I

couldn't make a living. Well, what of it? Is this short life of so much more importance than obedience to the commandments of God? When a man deliberately decides that it is, from that moment his life is not worth the living, since the glorifying of God is all that makes this life of any value. But suppose keeping the commandments of God should involve the loss of life; thousands of men and women have found that they couldn't "make a living" if they obeyed God, yet they chose death at the stake rather than disobedience to God. People honor the martyrs, and think that they too would have stood up boldly for the faith, and then refuse to do a simple duty for fear they *may* suffer some inconvenience. The same people will often suffer ten times the inconvenience from having their own way, with the prospect before them of losing the only life that is worthy of the name-eternal life. "For it is better, if the will of God be so, that if ye suffer for well-doing, than for evil-doing." *1 Peter 3:17. SITI October 21, 1886, page 640.11*

"By faith Moses, when he was come to years, refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter; choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season; esteeming the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures in Egypt; for he had respect unto the recompense of the reward." *Hebrews 11:24-26*. What is that? He esteemed the *reproach* of Christ greater riches than the treasures in Egypt. How few there are who view things as Moses did? They want to enter into the joy of the Lord, and they profess to believe that the treasures of heaven are worth more than those of earth; but they can't see anything pleasing in the prospect of suffering for Christ. But it is safe to say that those who do not see anything to be desired in suffering with Christ, have no just respect unto the recompense of the final reward. Here is a problem which may be of use in estimating the future happiness of the saints. If reproaches and sufferings for Christ bring more happiness than all things that this world contains, what must be the happiness when "God himself shall be with them, and be there God; and God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes closed"? If we do not suffer with Christ, we are not joint-heirs with him, and cannot be glorified with him. *Romans 8:17. SITI October 21, 1886, page 640.12*

The charm of Christ's teaching lies in its simplicity. But many

theological writers seem to forget that there are people who cannot be edified by huge words and high-flown sentences, or else they think that such people are beneath their notice. As a sample of such writing, we give the following extract from a book entitled "The Transfiguration of Christ":-*SITI October 21, 1886, page 640.13*

"On the resurrection of Christ our cosmology must stand; as on Christ himself, the *Logos* must stand all anthropology and theology. The resurrection of the Christ of God is that all-inclusive manifestation of the *Logos*, which in the beginning moved in chaos toward a cosmos, and which at last through that manifestation abolishes the primeval discord of life-and-death, thus giving man his (*Cosmos-Logos*) cosmology."*SITI October 21, 1886, page 640.14*

We trust that there are very few people on earth who could be edified by such reading. How different from the words of Paul, that master logician: "But the righteousness which is of faith speaketh on this wise, Say not in thine heart, Who shall ascend into heaven? (that is, to bring Christ down from above) or, Who shall descend into the deep? (that is, to bring up Christ again from the dead.) But what saith it? The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth, and in thy heart; that is, the word of faith, which we preach; that if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation."*Romans 10:6-10.SITI October 21, 1886, page 640.15*

October 28, 1886

“California Camp-Meeting” The Signs of the Times, 12, 41.

E. J. Waggoner

This meeting was the largest and the best camp-meetings ever held in this State. Such is the universal verdict. Indeed, all said that it was the best camp-meeting they had ever attended. It was located just outside the limits of the city of Woodland, in a field, which the owner, not an Adventist, kindly granted free of charge. The Woodland Water Company furnished water for the camp, free. This was no small item in the saving of expense. Very much smaller meetings, for one-half the time, have often paid sixty dollars or more for water. The Puget Sound Lumber Company also greatly favored the camp, by taking back, without charge, all lumber that was not cut.*SITI October 28, 1886, page 646.1*

There were one hundred and eighty-five tents pitched, and about eight hundred people camped on the ground. There were more Sabbath-keepers who attended, as some came to the first part of the meeting and went home to allow others to come to the last part; but the average attendance was about eight hundred. The attendance from town was not large, except on the first Sunday. There would have been more present the second Sunday if it had not rained. Those who did attend were well pleased, and the meeting seemed to have a good impression on the community.*SITI October 28, 1886, page 646.2*

During the thirteen days' meeting there were twenty-nine regular Bible-readings, besides several meetings for instruction in holding Bible-readings, twenty children's meetings, six meetings of the Conference, four of the Tract and Missionary Society, three of the Sabbath-school Association, besides prayer and social meetings, teachers' meetings, ministerial examinations, and class instruction in canvassing, and in keeping church, missionary, and Sabbath-school records.*SITI October 28, 1886, page 646.3*

The ministerial examinations were a new feature in this Conference, but were highly appreciated by all the ministers. The instruction

given was most valuable, and we believe that the introduction of this feature will tend to greatly raise the standard of the ministry. In this connection we may say that there was never before so great a degree of harmony and brotherly love among the ministers as now. Never before was there so little of the spirit of criticism as during this meeting. This same may be said of the rank and file. This certainly augurs well for the future prosperity of the cause. During the entire camp-meeting we heard not an impatient word or an unkind allusion.*SITI October 28, 1886, page 646.4*

The business meetings were especially interesting. They were the most profitable meetings held. Those who stay away from business meetings, thinking of them uninteresting, deprive themselves of a great blessing. We are thankful that there were not many such at this camp-meeting. The business pertaining to the Conference and Tract Society was performed without the slightest discord. It was especially noticeable that in these meetings the entire congregation was often moved to tears. There was never before so deep an interest taken in the spread of the work, and the salvation of souls.*SITI October 28, 1886, page 646.5*

The addresses from Mrs. E. G. White, that were read at different times, added greatly to the success of the meeting. Her appeals for greater consecration and union had good effect; and as the nearness of the end was vividly set before the people, an increasing spirit of solemnity rested on the congregation. The fact that probation for sinners will soon end, and that the Lord is soon coming, seemed more real to very many than ever before. Heartfelt confessions were made, and as God's tender mercy was manifest in Christ, was set forth, many were enabled to grasp by faith the living promises, and to go free in the Lord. The most encouraging feature was that almost from the first, individuals at the meetings in various parts of the camp would with tears of joy praise God for the blessing of sins forgiven. There was marked evidence throughout the meeting that the Spirit of the Lord was working.*SITI October 28, 1886, page 646.6*

The children's meetings were very profitable, and the interest in them increased till the close. The average attendance at these meetings was about sixty. It was the aim of the leaders to give

simple instruction in the great principles of the gospel. The little ones showed great interest in studying the Bible to learn both faith and duty, and the Spirit of the Lord made a deep impression on their hearts. During the meetings twenty-eight children gave their hearts to God, and there was every evidence that they were intelligently and hopefully converted. Several of these were baptized before they left camp, and others who had to leave will be baptized a home.*SITI October 28, 1886, page 646.7*

At three different times during the camp-meeting, efforts in behalf of the unconverted and backsliders were made in the large congregation. At each of these times from one hundred and fifty to two hundred came forward for prayers, and the most of these were labored with personally. At such a meeting on the last Sabbath, thirty-two arose in response to an inquiry as to how many had resolved at this meeting to keep the Sabbath. And the last Monday of the meeting thirty-four were baptized, and probably nearly as many more left the ground designing to be baptized at home at the first opportunity. Among those baptized was a young Chinese convert, who has been keeping the Sabbath for several months, having made considerable sacrifice to do so. We believe that he is the only Chinese Sabbath-keeper in the United States.*SITI October 28, 1886, page 646.8*

The Sabbath-schools on the two Sabbaths were interesting and profitable occasions. Lessons were well learned by both old and young. The class contributions for the two Sabbaths were \$102.21.*SITI October 28, 1886, page 646.9*

The persons who were appointed to canvass for periodicals during the meetings, did their work well, and met with a good degree of success. The number of subscriptions taken was 314, classified as follows: For the SIGNS OF THE TIMES, 76; *American Sentinel*, 53; The Review and Herald, 19; *Bible Echo*, 22; Sabbath-School Worker, 72; Pacific Health Journal, 72 The sales at the bookstand amounted to something over \$700.*SITI October 28, 1886, page 646.10*

On Sunday morning, October 17, Elder Haskell gave a little talk on the work in Australia, New Zealand, and Central Europe, and a

letter was read from Brother W. C. White, giving an account of the progress of the work in Russia, and of the imprisonment and release of Elder Conradi. The wants of the cause in California were also briefly stated, and then those who felt that it would be a pleasure to assist the cause with their means, were asked to pledge. Only a general call was made, and there was absolutely no urging, yet in a short time over one hundred thousand dollars was pledged for home and foreign missions. There was one feature of this movement that is worthy of note. Heretofore the bulk of the money raised has been by the poor class, but these pledges were mostly by the more wealthy. To be sure much of this amount was pledged on condition of disposing of property, but there was a strong determination expressed by the wealthy brethren to sell, even at a sacrifice, and to give not only of their means, but themselves to the cause of God. These pledges were not made in a burst of enthusiasm, but were the deliberate action of cool-headed businessmen who knew what they were about, and no one who knows the people of California will doubt that every dollar pledged is good. These men and women have been successful in gathering together earthly treasure, and are now determined to have treasures in heaven. *SITI October 28, 1886, page 646.11*

Besides these pledges, quite an amount of each was contributed in small amounts by those who could not pledge; an organ valued at \$125 was donated to the New Zealand Mission, \$75 was contributed towards buying an organ for the Australian Mission, and a good cow was given to the San Francisco City Mission. These liberal contributions were only the natural result of the good meetings which had preceded, and of the conviction that the end of all things is at hand, and that God is now saying to the servants, as to Moses of old, "Speak unto the children of Israel that they go forward." At the close of this meeting the Doxology was sung with a heartiness that showed that the people felt blessed in the sacrifices which they had made. *SITI October 28, 1886, page 646.12*

Monday, October, baptism was attended to, and ministers were appointed to their various fields of labor. In the evening Elder A. T. Jones gave a stirring half hour talk on National Reform as it concerns Seventh-day Adventists. This was followed by a praise meeting of an hour, after which Brother R. S. Owen was set apart to

the work of the gospel ministry, Elder Loughborough offering the prayer, and Elder Haskell giving the charge. Then the congregation united in singing, "All Hail the Power of Jesus' Name." Thus closed the meeting which will never be forgotten by at least a large part of those who attended it, and whose influence will be felt in the work until the saints meet in the kingdom of God. W.*SITI* *October 28, 1886, page 646.13*

November 4, 1886

“What about the Heathen?” The Signs of the Times, 12, 42.

E. J. Waggoner

A good many people nowadays are troubled about the heathen. That in itself is all right, if it leads to right action. Paul was troubled about the heathen, so much so that he exclaimed, “Woe is me if I preach not the gospel.” But in the most of this modern worry over the heathen, we have seen no tendency toward a disposition to relieve their needs. In fact, neither the heathen nor the people themselves are benefited by it, and could not be expected to be. The question is, “What is going to become of the heathen who have never heard the gospel.” This is answered in two ways. One answer is that they will all be damned; and in this answer people see the destruction of nearly all the heathen without any chance for salvation, because they imagine that but very few have ever heard the gospel. Another answer, and that which is now the more popular one, is that those who “have not had a chance” in this life will be granted a chance in the future life. *SITI November 4, 1886, page 662.1*

The tendency of both these views is deadening to all spiritual growth. Try to persuade a man to accept Christ and obey the truth, and he will ask, “What is going to become of all those who never heard this gospel? Are they all lost?” And so much more interested is the man in the dead heathen than he is in his own living soul, that he will pay no attention to present duty till that question is settled. Moreover he usually has already settled it in his own mind according to the first answer given above, and then says, “Well, if God will condemn men without giving them a chance, he doesn’t deal justly, and I will have nothing to do with him.” As for the other view, once let a sinner become indoctrinated into the error that some men will have a future probation, and he will quickly draw the legitimate conclusion that all men may have a second probation; and since in matters spiritual there is a universal tendency to await “a more convenient season,” such an one will make no effort to turn from the error of his ways. *SITI November 4, 1886, page 662.2*

Now while the most sensible way for each one to do would be to attend to the call of mercy which he knows is extended to him, paying no attention to matters which cannot possibly concern him, it may be well to note how the heathen stand related to God. The matter is not a complicated one, as we find it in the Bible.*SITI November 4, 1886, page 662.3*

1. Paul says that the heathen are “without excuse,” because ever since the foundation of the world, the invisible things of God, that is, “his eternal power and Godhead,” are “clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made.” *Romans 1:20*. Thus we find that if there are any heathen who do not know, (1) that there is a God; (2) that he is all-powerful, the Creator of all things, and therefore before all things; and (3) that to this Supreme Being his allegiance is rightfully due, it is his own fault. “The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament sheweth his handiwork.” *Psalms 19:1*. And so plainly is God revealed in nature that he who says, even in thought, that there is no God, is justly called a fool. *Psalms 14:1*.*SITI November 4, 1886, page 662.4*

2. There are none who have not some consciousness of right and wrong. Paul says, “For when the Gentiles, which have not the written law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves; which show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another.” *Romans 2:14, 15*. It is not possible, by the light of nature alone, to know the fullness of the truth as it is in Jesus, but there is not a man upon earth who does not have enough knowledge of what is right to justly condemn him if he does not profit by that knowledge. It is true that men may “not like to retain God in their knowledge,” and may ignore the good and practice the bad so persistently as to completely deaden all sensibility, and be given over “to a mind void of judgment” (*Romans 1:28*, margin); but the fact that this is done only proves the truth of the statement that all men have naturally a certain amount of knowledge of right and wrong.*SITI November 4, 1886, page 662.5*

3. If a man persists in stifling his conscience, and is determined that he will not do even the little good that he knows, he must inevitably

go into deeper darkness and degradation. It would be impossible for God to give him greater light, since he resolutely shuts his eyes to that which he has. And it is just as true that if a man has a fixed purpose to practice all the good that he knows, he will not only be aided in his effort, but will be given greater light. "If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine." *John 7:17*. "Light is sown for the righteous." *Psalms 97:11*. And "unto the upright there ariseth light in the darkness." *Psalms 112:4*. *SITI November 4, 1886, page 662.6*

Numerous examples of this are given in the Bible. Abraham was brought up among idolaters. *Joshua 24:2*. But he loved to retain God in his knowledge, and so resolutely did that which he knew to be right. And because of this integrity of purpose, God called him out from his heathen associates, and revealed his truth to him in an especial manner. The centurion Cornelius is another example. He had risen above his heathen education, and feared the true God, living up to all the light that he had. To him Peter was sent by divine command, to give him the full light of the gospel. So it will ever be. No matter how remote from civilization a heathen may be, if he sincerely desires to do right, God will enlighten him. A minister may not be sent to him, as Peter was to Cornelius, but God's word will be in some manner conveyed to him, and the entrance of that always gives light. That, without man's interpretation, is able to make any man "wise unto salvation." *SITI November 4, 1886, page 662.7*

4. Moreover, in Paul's day all the heathen had heard the word of life. He says, "So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God. But I say, Have they not heard? Yes verily, their sound went into all the earth, and their words unto the ends of the world." *Romans 10:17, 18*. These words were spoken, by David, of the heavenly bodies, but Paul applies them to the gospel. And that this is so is proved by his words to the Colossians: "And you... hath he reconciled in the body of his flesh through death, to present you holy and unblameable and unproveable in his sight; if ye continue in the faith grounded and settled, and be not moved away from the hope of the gospel, which ye have heard, and which was preached to every creature which is under heaven." *Colossians 1:21-23*. *SITI November 4, 1886, page 662.8*

“And as it is appointed unto men once to die, but after this the judgment; so Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many.” *Hebrews 9:27, 28*. “There is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved,” except the name of Jesus. Christ was once offered for the sins of men on probation in this life. At the close of this probation, he will come the second time “without sin,” for the salvation of those who look for him. When he comes, he no longer bears the sins of any. Now a probation for sinners without any means outside of themselves whereby to be saved from sin, would be no probation at all. But Christ bears no sins except for men on probation in this life, before his coming; and outside of Christ there is no salvation; therefore there can be no probation after this life. Just before Christ comes it will be said: “He that is unjust, let him be unjust still; and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still: and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still: and he that is holy, let him be holy still.” *Revelation 22:11*. After that there will be no more “chance” for anybody. *SITI November 4, 1886, page 662.9*

But this fact, together with the fact that the Judge of all the earth will do right, is further evidence that every man on earth will in this life have ample opportunity to “lay hold on eternal life.” Indeed, why should it be otherwise? God “hath wrought us for this self-same thing;” that is, he has placed us on this earth in order that we may fit ourselves by his grace for an immortal life; and to say that, when God has placed man on this earth for one definite purpose, he will deprive any of an opportunity to learn what that purpose is, is to charge God with folly. The truth of the matter is that the very fact that man exists on this earth is an evidence that he is having a “chance” for a better existence. *SITI November 4, 1886, page 662.10*

None of these things release us from obligation to do all in our power to spread the gospel, for God usually works through human agencies. He has in mercy to us allowed us to become “workers together with him,” that thus we may finally enter into the joy of the Lord. But let no one charge God with folly and injustice, by saying that the heathen or any other people do not have a chance, nor foolishly neglect the word of truth, in the vain expectation of a “more convenient season.” “Behold, now is the accepted time; behold,

now is the day of salvation.” W.*SITI* November 4, 1886, page
662.11

November 11, 1886

“The Spirit as Guide” *The Signs of the Times*, 12, 43.

E. J. Waggoner

When Christ told his disciples that he was about to go away, and that they could not follow him, their hearts were filled with sorrow and anxiety. They dreaded to face an unfriendly world alone. He had been their guide and instructor, and they had learned much from his teachings. They knew of no one who could fill his place. Peter had echoed the sentiments of all the disciples when, in answer to Christ's inquiry if they also would go away, he said, “Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life.” They knew that no one else could do for them what Jesus had done; and the thought of being separated from him was a sad one. *SITI November 11, 1886, page 678.1*

To comfort them, Christ gave them the assurance that he would come again and receive them unto himself, and that by this means they could again be with him. But even this promise was not sufficient, for there would still intervene a long period during which they would be left alone. How could they do without the presence and counsel of their Lord? *SITI November 11, 1886, page 678.2*

Again Jesus meets the difficulty by promising that whatsoever they should ask in his name should be done for them; and he added, “And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you forever; even the Spirit of truth.” *John 14:16, 17*. This Spirit was to be sent in his name, and was to take his place until his return. Said Christ, “I will not leave you comfortless [orphans]; I will come to you.” This coming does not refer to his personal, visible coming, when he will receive his people to himself, but to the Spirit who should come in his name. The Spirit was to be their guide, to prepare them for his coming at the last day. *SITI November 11, 1886, page 678.3*

The offices of the Spirit are many; but there is a special one pointed out in this discourse of our Lord. Said he: “These things have I spoken unto you, being yet present with you. But the Comforter,

which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you.” *John 14:25, 26*. It is as a teacher that the Spirit is here brought to view. *SITI November 11, 1886, page 678.4*

Many persons entertain very erroneous views as to the manner in which the Spirit operates. They imagine that it will teach them something which the Bible does not contain. When certain Bible truths are presented to them for their observance, they excuse themselves from all responsibility in the matter by saying that they are led by the Spirit of God, and do not feel it their duty to do that particular thing. They say the Spirit was given to guide into all truth; and, consequently, if it was necessary to obey that portion of the Scripture, it would have been brought to their notice. The fact that they do not feel impressed to obey is proof to their minds that there is no necessity for obedience. To such persons the Bible is of no account; they make its truth depend entirely upon their own feelings. And they actually charge God with the inconsistency of authorizing his Spirit to speak in contradiction of his revealed word. The fact that God cannot lie should convince anyone that his Spirit and his word must always be in harmony. *SITI November 11, 1886, page 678.5*

Christ prayed for his disciples, “Sanctify them through thy truth; thy word is truth.” The psalmist David said, “Thy righteousness is an everlasting righteousness, and thy law is the truth.” From these passages we learn that when Christ said, “When he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth,” he meant that the Spirit would lead them into a proper understanding of that which had already been revealed. He plainly stated this when he said, “He shall teach you all things, and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you.” Many things that Christ said were not understood at the time; but they were made plain by the Spirit, after Christ had ascended to heaven. And it is thus that the Spirit teaches us now; it leads those who are humble and teachable into a proper understanding of the written word of God. *SITI November 11, 1886, page 678.6*

Paul gives testimony on this point which is not uncertain. In

Ephesians 6:13-17, he describes the Christian's armor. The following is the concluding portion: "Above all, taking the shield of faith, wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked. And take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, *which is the word of God.*" Christ said that when the Comforter, the Holy Spirit, should come, he would "reprove [convince] the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment." Paul says that "by the law is the knowledge of sin." Both these passages are harmonized by the one quoted from Paul to the Ephesians. The Spirit does indeed convince of sin, but it is by impressing on the minds and hearts of men the claims of God's word. The Bible is the sword, the instrument by which the Spirit pierces the heart and lays bare its wickedness. The Spirit is the active agent, but the word of God is that through which it works. The two always act in unison. *SITI November 11, 1886, page 678.7*

We should look with suspicion upon any spirit that counsels opposition to the word of God. John tells us that there are many spirits, and that we are to try them. In Isaiah we are told by what we are to try them: "To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." *Isaiah 8:20*. It is the spirit of darkness that leads men to act contrary to the word of God. W. *SITI November 11, 1886, page 678.8*

November 18, 1886

“At the Seat of Mormondom” The Signs of the Times, 12, 44.

E. J. Waggoner

Having time on our way East to spend two days at Salt Lake City, we improved the opportunity, and made the most of our time in viewing the city and learning the peculiarities of its peculiar people. We are not of the class who can generalize with the air of authority about a place after two days' stay in it, and shall therefore confine ourselves to what we saw and heard, especially the latter, for as an old Mormon official said, “It isn't what ye see, but what ye hear, that's going to benefit ye.” *SITI November 18, 1886, page 694.1*

As one of the days of our stay was Sunday, we attended the general service at the tabernacle. Here we may remark that only one service a week is held in the tabernacle,-at 2 P.M. Sunday afternoons. The city is divided into twenty-one wards, each presided over by a bishop and in each of which there is a meeting-house. On Sunday mornings there is a Sunday-school and perhaps a short service in each of these ward meeting-houses, and another short service at 6 o'clock each Sunday evening. Once a week, as before stated, there is a general meeting in the tabernacle. *SITI November 18, 1886, page 694.2*

Of this tabernacle, as well as of the other noted places in the city, but little need be said, simply because they are noted. The structure is exceedingly plain both within and without. It is oval in shape, being 200 feet long, 150 feet wide, and 70 feet high. The dome rests on low but massive brick columns, which, with the intervening windows, form the wall of the building. Besides these are columns, the roof has no support. The building has the appearance of this huge dish-cover resting upon blocks. But although it is ungainly, its acoustic properties are wonderful. The dropping of a pin at one extremity can be heard at the other extremity as distinctly as though it were a nail dropped close by. And there is no echo. When the building is filled to its utmost capacity,-13,000,-a person in any part of it can hear the speaker without difficulty, provided the remainder of the people keep still; we doubt if they ever do. The organ in the

tabernacle is said to be the second largest in the world, and the music and singing were really fine. The singing was done by a large choir of trained singers, and the congregation did not join.*SITI November 18, 1886, page 694.3*

The services themselves struck us as being exceedingly formal. Everything was done in a sort of matter-of-course way, much as a railroad employe performs his routine labor. There was nothing in any of the services that would tend to impress one with a sense of sacredness,-at least so it seemed to us; and we noticed that but few of the congregation acted as though they had come to worship. There was a great lack of interest on the part of the people. Women and girls played with the babies, to which there were many more present than we ever before saw in any assembly, and there was a constant moving about. We are sorry to be obliged to say that this spirit of inattention is not confined to the Mormons; but we never before saw a congregation that was not quiet a part of the time.*SITI November 18, 1886, page 694.4*

For this lack of interest on the part of the people, we think we can see ample reason. Mormonism is, on a small scale, is a State religion. Church membership is a necessary qualification for public office. Church officers are *ex officio* government officers, because the church *is* the government. Under such circumstances, church services must soon become a matter of form, just as the routine duties of a State official are performed mechanically. And when the services are performed mechanically the people will listen mechanically, when they listen at all. Mormonism is a perfect model (except, of course, as to belief) of what the whole country will be when the National Reformers shall have accomplished their design. In time past, when the fear of the United States Government did not stand before the eyes of the Mormons, and the guns of the United States fort did not command the town, a non-Mormon did not have any rights in Salt Lake City, and it was at the risk of this life that one ventured there, especially if he dropped a word against Mormonism; and when the proposed religious amendment to the Constitution is adopted, no one who does not profess the State religion will have any rights in the United States, and one who ventures to talk, and especially to act, contrary to the established religion, will do so at his own peril. Church officers will then be Government officers as

well, and the gospel will, so far as “the church” is concerned, be dead. Then *Revelation 18:2* will meet its complete fulfillment: “Babylon the great is fallen, is fallen, and is become the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird.” No National Reformer has any right to cast a stone at the Mormons. *SITI November 18, 1886, page 694.5*

On the day that we were at the tabernacle, there was a short address by a “converted Jew,” and a sermon by Bishop Whitney. The Jew applied all the prophecies to literal Israel, predicting a return of all the Jews to Jerusalem, there to rule over their enemies, with Christ as their king. One peculiar thing in the services was that the sacrament was administered while the other services were going on. After the Jew’s address, one of the elders asked a blessing on the bread, which was then carried around through the congregation by several men, while the bishop began his discourse. After the bishop had spoken about twenty minutes, he stopped very abruptly, and sat down. Then the same elder as before asked a blessing on the *water*, that being used instead of the fruit of vine. The men then began to pass the water, and the bishop resumed his discourse. *SITI November 18, 1886, page 694.6*

The sermon was a history of Mormonism and a representation of its doctrines. Probably this subject was taken because there were many strangers present. It interested us only because it was a summary of Mormonism, by the best authority, and because it contains some egregious errors of which we had never heard before. Otherwise it was somewhat tedious; if we had been as familiar with the subject as a greater part of his auditors doubtless were, we should probably have been about as much bored as they seemed to be. *SITI November 18, 1886, page 694.7*

Following are some of the points of the discourse: Referring to the Jew’s address, he said that as the Jews were building up Jerusalem, so the Mormons were building up Zion. *Isaiah 2:2-5* was applied to the Mormons. “Because we believe in the literal fulfillment of this prophecy, and look for the literal return of Christ to reign over us,” said the speaker, “we are stigmatized as traitors.” He did not deny that they are in opposition to the Government; the only ground on which they could deny that they are essentially traitors to

this Government, is that they do not acknowledge its authority in any particular. Joseph Smith is declared to be the “stick of Ephraim” (*Ezekiel 37:16*), and later the Book of Mormon was declared to be the “stick of Judah.” He said that the Mormons do not deny the divinity of the Bible; they hold it as equal to the Book of Mormon. But as the Mormons are all Ephraimites, and the Book of Mormon is the “stick of the Ephraim,” while the Bible is the “stick of Judah,” the inferences seem to be that even though they joined the two sticks together, the Ephraimites would regard their own stick with the greater favor. *SITI November 18, 1886, page 694.8*

The speaker said that when the plates of the Book of Mormon were given to Smith by the angel he (Smith) was able to interpret and translate them because he had the Urim and the Thummim. Then followed a long account of the Nephites (the aborigines of this country) and their wars with the Lamanites. This country is considered to be the land of promise to Joseph, and the Rocky Mountains are “the everlasting hills.” *Genesis 49:26*. Jacob’s blessing was not fulfilled to Joseph in Palestine, since that tribe was not a very powerful in that land; hence it must be fulfilled here. The Nephites came to this country ages ago. When Christ ascended from the disciples upon the Mount of Olives he was wafted across the ocean to this country, where he chose twelve apostles. These were the “other sheep not of this fold” (*John 10:16*), and to them he spoke the many things which the disciples could not bear. *John 16:12*. The “lost tribes” of Israel are now somewhere in the frozen North, whence they will someday be led to “Zion” (Salt Lake City) by a prophet who will smite the icebergs so that they will melt before them. In bringing these lost tribes to “Zion” a miracle will be wrought, “beside which the passage of the Red Sea will pale into insignificance.” The prophet who is to conduct these tribes is John, who remains “superior to death” until the Lord shall come to reign over “Zion.” In the meantime he is probably up North among the “lost tribes.” Their claim is that John the Baptist came to anoint Joe Smith to the Aaronic priesthood, and that Peter, James, and John came to bestow upon him the apostleship, and to anoint him to the Melchizedek priesthood. Thus it will be seen that they have every office that the Jews ever had, and many that they never had, and all in a greater abundance; for they have many “high places.” *SITI November 18, 1886, page 694.9*

But time would fail us to recount all the absurdities that were dealt out with all seriousness. The next morning, while viewing the tabernacle, and the Assembly Hall, the old Mormon who thought we could be benefited only by what we might hear, gave us many additional ideas. In obedience, no doubt, to the command to “be instant in a season, out of season,” he preached us a sermon nearly an hour in length, interrupted only by an occasional question for us. The main thing of interest to us in this discourse was that part which related to polygamy. Many very specious arguments were adduced in its favor, but they all seemed to be summed up in the one statement that is “according to nature.” We mentally agreed that it might be compatible with a depraved human nature, but utterly inconsistent with the divine nature of which true saints must be partakers. But the most fanatical Mormon will hardly assert that polygamy is in accordance with the nature of women. To be sure the women talk in favor of it, and many no doubt think that it is of divine appointment; but we are inclined to think that most of them are at heart like the one whom we met, who thought it all right for a man to have more than one wife, but upon been pressed, admitted that she wouldn’t like to have *her* husband do so. *SITI November 18, 1886, page 694.10*

Before we heard the particulars of Mormonism from the mouths of its advocates, we thought that Spiritualism was the only form of religion which has not *some* truth in it, but we shall have to make another exception for Mormonism. It is true that they professedly accept the Bible, as do the Spiritualists, and they have “baptism for the remission of sins,” and profess to believe some other Bible doctrines; but everything is so distorted as to bear scarcely any semblance to Bible truth. Like Spiritualism, it is a gigantic delusion, wholly of the devil. It is admirably calculated to catch those who are ignorant of the Bible, and are in a condition to be imposed upon by the hierarchy, and also those who are sensually inclined. It will eventually culminate in Spiritualism pure and simple. Those with whom we talked seem to be really sincere, and we believe they were. The one who discoursed to our benefit had been a Mormon for over thirty years, as a “high priest,” and has shown his faith in polygamy by taking four wives. He is doubtless as sincere in his belief as the Hindoo is in his. The originators of Mormonism were beyond question intentional deceivers, but in process of time no

doubt came to believe their own lies.*SITI November 18, 1886, page 694.11*

The Mormons exhibit every evidence of temporal prosperity, and, like the ancient Pharisees, they accept this as evidence of the favor of God. If numbers or temporal prosperity, however, are evidence of the favor of God, the Catholic Church would have to be accepted as the true church. But there is just one standard of truth, and that is the Bible, and the Bible alone. Tried by this standard, Mormonism is seen to be a fatal delusion. Yet we doubt not but that there are many deceived ones even among Mormons, to whom God will yet grant repentance, "to the acknowledging of the truth."*SITI November 18, 1886, page 695.1*

As we passed by the magnificent structures built for "worship," for business, or as residences for members of the hierarchy, and saw the evidences of the sagacity of the founders of that city, and then thought of the murderous "Danites," the Mountain Meadow massacre, and the "blood atonement" which is a thing of the past only because of the fear of the hated United States laws, one text continually forced itself upon our mind. It was this:-*SITI November 18, 1886, page 695.2*

"Woe to him that coveteth an evil covetousness to his house, that he may set his nest on high, that he may be delivered from the power of evil! Thou hast consulted shame to thy house by cutting off many people, and hast sinned against thy soul. For the stone shall cry out of the wall, and the beam out of the timber shall answer it. Woe to him that buildeth a town with blood, and stablisheth a city by iniquity!" *Habakkuk 2:9-12. W.SITI November 18, 1886, page 695.3*

November 25, 1886

“The Origin of Sunday” The Signs of the Times, 12, 45.

E. J. Waggoner

Following is a part of an article by the Rev. A. H. Lewis, D. D., which first appeared under the above heading in the *Popular Science Monthly*, and was copied into the *Chicago Tribune* of October 30, 1886. It contains nothing new, for it would be difficult to find anything new on this subject; but it is a very clear and concise statement of the origin of Sunday observance, and is worthy of a careful perusal. We are very glad to see articles of this class given a place in popular magazines and newspapers. It shows that the Sabbath question is rapidly coming to the front. W.*SITI November 25, 1886, page 710.1*

“Who Is My Neighbor?” The Signs of the Times, 12, 45.

E. J. Waggoner

The following question has been asked:-*SITI November 25, 1886, page 710.2*

“According to the parable of the good Samaritan (*Luke 10:30-37*), who is our neighbor? Do verses 36 and 37 teach that they only are our neighbors who show themselves to be neighborly, and that it is only such that we are to love as our *neighbor* while we are to love others as *enemies*?”*SITI November 25, 1886, page 710.3*

We are not able to find in the Bible any distinction between the treatment of “neighbors” and “enemies.” If there were such a distinction, the parable referred to would certainly read differently from what it does. Between the Jews and the Samaritans there was bitterness amounting to almost deadly hatred. See *John 4:9; Luke 9:51-54*. For this enmity it seems that the Jews were chiefly responsible, as they considered themselves far superior to the Samaritans, whom they regarded with contempt, treating them as dogs. The worst thing the unbelieving Jews could say in reproach of Christ was, “Say we not well that thou art a Samaritan and hast a

devil?" *John 8:4*. To call him a Samaritan was to brand him with him with infamy. *SITI November 25, 1886, page 710.4*

In the parable we have a man, presumably a Jew, since he was going down to Jericho from Jerusalem, who was maltreated by robbers, and left for dead. Some of his own countrymen, a priest and a Levite, passed by, and left him to his fate. But a Samaritan, one of the despised and hated race, came by, and did to the wounded man as is described. He could not have done more for him if he had been his brother. Now the question is, Who was my neighbor to him that fell among thieves? The answer is, "He that showed mercy upon him," and this answer is accepted. The good Samaritan was neighbor to the disabled Jew, whom he treated as his own neighbor. And yet, the Jew was the enemy of the Samaritan. The only inference is, that when the law says, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," we are to hold ourselves ready to serve anybody who needs our assistance, and are not stop to inquire whether the needy person is a "neighbor" or "enemy" and have two standards of action. In other words, our *enemies* are to be treated as our *neighbors*; or, better still, we are to act as though we had no enemies. In our dealings with our fellow-men we are not to consider if any man is our enemy, but are to treat all with kindly consideration. *SITI November 25, 1886, page 711.1*

This is in harmony with our Saviour's words in the sermon on the mount: "Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbour, and hate thine enemy. But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you; that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven: for he maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust." *Matthew 5:43-45*. God dispenses the favors of his Providence impartially on the good and the bad. Blasphemers, as well as those who praise, are the objects of God's kind of care. If we would be his children, we must do likewise. It is not in accordance with human nature so to do. This can be done only when we are fully imbued with the Spirit of him who on the cross prayed for his relentless persecutors, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." W. *SITI November 25, 1886, page 711.2*

December 2, 1886

“Items from the General Conference” *The Signs of the Times*, 12, 46.

E. J. Waggoner

The twenty-fifth annual session of the General Conference of Seventh-day Adventists convened in Battle Creek, Mich., Thursday, November 18, at 9 A.M. As this body has the oversight of all the missionary work done among Seventh-day Adventists, its proceedings indicates the extent of the spread of the Third Angel's Message, then we therefore design to give our readers some of the main features of this session.*SITI December 2, 1886, page 726.1*

The first meeting was chiefly taken up with organization and the appointing of committees, of which the following were named: On Nominations-J. Fargo, J. R. Goodrich, C. L. Boyd; on Resolutions: R. A. Underwood, E. J. Waggoner, A. B. Oyen; on Licenses and Credentials-S. N. Haskell, R. L. Whitney, G. G. Rupert; on Auditing-Harmon Lindsey, D. T. Jones, D. R. Oviatt, J. Fargo, J. H. Morrison, H. Grant; on Distribution of Labor-G. I. Butler, S. N. Haskell, R. A. Underwood, D. M. Canright, A. J. Breed, Lewis Johnson, M. C. Wilcox; on Religious Services-R. M. Kilgore, L. McCoy, G. C. Tenney.*SITI December 2, 1886, page 726.2*

The President, Elder Geo. I. Butler, then made an address, in the course of which he gave the following items of interest: The last year has been one of marked prosperity to the cause; the publishing houses have sold more denominational books than ever before; our institutions of learning are attended by more persons who are preparing for the work, than at any previous period in their history; and there was never before so great an interest in the matter of education among our people as that the present time. There is also a greater willingness on the part of people to listen to the truth than ever before.*SITI December 2, 1886, page 726.3*

At the second meeting additional delegates presented their credentials. The Conference, as organized, is composed of delegates representing the following Conferences and Missions:Illinois, Michigan, Indiana, California, Dakota, New

England, Minnesota, Kansas, Ohio, Iowa, Nebraska, New York, Wisconsin, Pennsylvania, Missouri, Colorado, Vermont, Maine, Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, Canada, Texas, North Pacific and Upper Columbia (Oregon and Washington), the Central Europe, England, Sweden, Norway and Denmark, North Carolina, and the general Southern field. *SITI December 2, 1886, page 726.4*

The greater part of the second meeting was devoted to the consideration of the Sunday law presentations in Arkansas and Tennessee. In this discussion the following facts were brought out: In Arkansas everything that a man has, even to the smallest particle of household furniture, is liable to be levied on in payment of a fine for laboring on Sunday. Although the sentence usually runs that the convicted person shall pay a certain fine and the costs of prosecution, with the alternative of one day in jail for each dollar of the fine and costs, lying in jail the specified time does not satisfy the judgment. After a man has served out his time in jail, his property may still be seized, or he may, if he has no property, be compelled to work out the fine. Besides this, the prisoners are treated as convicts having no rights whatever. They are considered as having any conscience, and may be compelled while in jail to labor on the Sabbath, with the alternative of the most barbarous punishment if they refuse. It will then appear that the law violates every principle of justice, and is most inhuman and cruel. And this appears, still more plainly when we learn that offenses such as stealing are not punished with anything like such severity. *SITI December 2, 1886, page 726.5*

More than this, these prosecutions are conducted against only those who keep the seventh day of the week, "according to the commandment." Brother Armstrong, who served out one sentence in jail for doing a little work in his garden on Sunday, stated that when he was brought before the grand jury to testify in another case, he was asked if he knew of the parties who had done labor on Sunday. He replied that he did, and when asked for the names, he mentioned the employés of the railroad companies. Then he was asked if he knew of the others. In reply he mentioned the hotel keepers. In like manner he cited the jury to delivery men, hackmen, barbers, and the saloon keepers. Finally he was asked if he knew of any Seventh-day Adventists who labored on Sunday, and when the

names of some of them had been obtained, the jury was satisfied. The Seventh-day Adventists were indicted, and the others were not molested. In some cases the brethren have been told that they would not be molested, or that they would be released from the remainder of their term of imprisonment, if they would promise not to keep the Sabbath anymore.*SITI December 2, 1886, page 726.6*

Thus it appears that these Sunday law prosecutions are nothing else than the meanest kind of religious persecution; and that the persecutors are moved, not by a regard for the Sunday, but by a hatred for the Sabbath. This is still further shown by the manner in which the testimony has been gained which has convicted these persons. In some cases two persons, one a professed Sunday observer and the other a Sabbath-keeper, have transacted certain business together on Sunday; the Sunday-keeper would then go and tell of it, and his companion would be arrested, while he would not be molested.*SITI December 2, 1886, page 726.7*

In the face of all these things there are people who have the unblushing effrontery to say that there is no danger of there being any persecution for conscience's sake in this country, and that Sunday laws do not interfere with any man's religion! The fact is, and every candid person must admit it, that Sunday laws as they are executed in this State of Arkansas, are unjust and inhuman, and utterly subversive of every principle of civil or religious freedom. And the people of Arkansas are no different from the people of other States. The law is administered there no differently from what a similar law would be administered anywhere else. The fault is not primarily with the law, but with the people; and when the National Reform movement shall have triumphed, the Arkansas persecutions will be repeated with tenfold severity all over the United States.*SITI December 2, 1886, page 726.8*

We do not believe, however, that the time for the triumph of this movement has come just yet. We believe that the Constitution of the United States is the best and most just document ever made by men, and that it will condemn the iniquitous proceedings that are being carried on under the mask of the law; and when the Constitution has thus spoken, it will henceforth be so clear to all the world that none need be mistaken, that the work of the National

Reform party is a direct attempt to overthrow the best charter of human liberty that is in existence, and to bring in religious oppression.*SITI December 2, 1886, page 726.9*

The greater part of Friday, the 19th, was devoted to the consideration of the wants of the foreign missions. The great want is consecrated laborers. We have only a few items of interest concerning the foreign workers presented by Elder B. L. Whitney, who spoke for the Swiss Conference and Central Europe, Elder M. C. Wilcox, who spoke for England, and Elder A. B. Oyen, who spoke for Sweden, Norway, and Denmark. The Swiss Conference has three ordained and seven licensed ministers. The Conference has fifteen churches and about three hundred members. These churches, however, are not all in Switzerland; two are in Germany, four in France, two in Italy, and one in Rumania. Elder Whitney stated that he knew of only three Seventh-day Adventist families in Switzerland who own the houses in which they live, and many of them are in the extremest poverty. Yet notwithstanding this, they have paid into the Conference treasury during the past year, nearly \$10 per member.*SITI December 2, 1886, page 726.10*

In England hard times are still a greater obstacle to the spread of the truth than in Switzerland. In every city there are thousands of skilled workmen who are unemployed. If a man began to keep the Sabbath he is quite sure to lose his position, and if he once loses it, there is little prospect of regaining it since scores as competent as he stand ready to take it. Still, in spite of these things in the way of living out the truth, many conscientious persons are found to take their stand for God and his truth, and they do not starve to death either.*SITI December 2, 1886, page 726.11*

During the year, 8,154 ships have been visited by the ship missionaries in England. These ships carry the truth to every nation under heaven. Through this agency a gentleman in Finland received papers and books and began to keep the Sabbath, and through his efforts a company of twenty Sabbath-keepers has been raised up, who will soon be visited by Elder Matteson.*SITI December 2, 1886, page 726.12*

Many other instances were related, showing how the truth of the

Third Angel's Message cannot be hid, but we can mention only two. A gentleman, a Baptist, received part of a copy of *Present Truth*, wrapped about some goods. He became deeply interested, and called at the office and bought the back numbers of *Present Truth*, also of the pamphlet "Truth Found," and the tract "Who Changed the Sabbath?" which he saw advertised. He is much awakened over the Sabbath question. *SITI December 2, 1886, page 726.13*

Elder Whitney also mentioned a very interesting circumstance. Brother Vuillenmier baptized a company of twenty-two persons at Neuchatel. A report of this was published in a religious paper in Paris. This report was read by some French Baptists in the Argentine Republic, South America, and awakened their interests. One of this company had been in Switzerland, and he told the others that the people who performed this baptism keep the Sabbath. As a result of this six of the company had begun to keep the Lord Sabbath. They have sent for *Les Signes des Temps*, published at Basel. *SITI December 2, 1886, page 726.14*

In England there are now three organized churches of Seventh-day Adventists, containing eighty-one members. There are besides this forty who are not yet church-members. *SITI December 2, 1886, page 726.15*

In Norway the people are religiously inclined, and are willing to listen to the truth. It is quite easy to convince them of its binding claim, but quite difficult to induce them to take their stand, owing to their limited means of obtaining a living. Still poverty does not deter all. In Norway there are three churches and 175 members. The Swedish Conference has ten churches and 250 members, besides 100 Sabbath-keepers not yet connected with any church. Denmark has nine churches and 250 members. *SITI December 2, 1886, page 726.16*

These facts but poorly show how the truth is spreading. Still there is a great work to be done. This does not indicate, however, that it will be a long while before it is done. The work will all be done within this generation, for "this generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled." Before this generation passes away the Lord will come, and the work of warning the world will have been completed.

Therefore the only conclusion is that if those who come to work have been intrusted are unfaithful to their trust, God will set them aside and put his work into the hands of those who will connect with him and follow his opening providence. The cause will go on to triumph whether we do or not.*SITI December 2, 1886, page 726.17*

The religious services thus far have been interesting and profitable. Yesterday morning (Sabbath, Nov. 20) at 5:30 A.M., Elder Butler delivered a most impressive and instructive discourse to the ministers and missionary workers. At 10:30 Elder Haskell delivered a sermon on the Judgment which made a solemn impression on many minds. In the afternoon there was a social meeting, and in the evening a large congregations gave careful attention to a lecture by Dr. J. H. Kellogg, on the "Religion of the Body." The meeting has only just begun, and more items of interest may be expected next week. *Battle Creek, Mich., Nov. 21. W.SITI December 2, 1886, page 727.1*

"Good and Bad Gifts from God" The Signs of the Times, 12, 46.

E. J. Waggoner

"And I gave them my statutes, and showed them my judgments, which if a man do, he shall even live in them." *Ezekiel 20:11.SITI December 2, 1886, page 727.2*

"Wherefore, I gave them also statutes that were not good, and judgments whereby they should not live." *Ezekiel 20:25.SITI December 2, 1886, page 728.1*

These two texts have been the subject of a good deal of controversy, and the latter one has been used by infidel cavilers as an argument against the goodness of God. The two verses, occurring as they do in such close connection, and referring to things so directly opposite in their nature, are worthy of a careful consideration. Fortunately the data for the explanation of both verses is supplied in the context. A misunderstanding of these texts, as in all other cases, arises from not considering the connection and not comparing scripture which scripture.*SITI December 2, 1886, page 728.2*

As to the meaning of the first verse there can be no difference of opinion. It evidently refers to the ten commandments. These statutes and judgments were delivered to the people when they had been brought out of the land of Egypt into the wilderness; and the statutes are the only ones "which if a man do, he shall even live in them." Some one may object that no one can live by keeping the commandments, but that is only because no one has done them. "All have sinned, and come short of the glory of God" (*Romans 3:24*), therefore no man can be justified by the law in the sight of God. Nevertheless it is a fixed and universal truth that "the *doers* of the law will be justified." *SITI December 2, 1886, page 728.3*

If the judgments "which if a man do, he shall even live in them" are the perfect and holy ten commandments, then the "statutes that were not good," and the "judgments whereby they should *not* live," must be something directly opposed to the ten commandments. This will more readily appear by reading the entire connection, which we quote:-*SITI December 2, 1886, page 728.4*

(7) "Then said I unto them, Cast ye away every man the abominations of his eyes, and defile not yourselves with the idols of Egypt' I am the Lord your God. (8) But they rebelled against me, and would not hearken unto me; they did not every man cast away the abominations of their eyes, neither did they forsake the idols of Egypt; then I said, I will pour out my fury upon them, to accomplish my anger against them in the midst of the land of Egypt. (9) But I wrought for my name's sake, that it should not be polluted before the heathen, among whom they were, in whose sight I made myself known unto them, in bringing them forth out of the land of Egypt. (10) Wherefore I caused them to go forth out of the land of Egypt, and brought them into the wilderness. (11) And I gave them my statutes, and showed them my judgments, which if a man do, he shall even live in them. (12) Moreover also I gave them my Sabbaths, to be a sign between me and them, that they might know that I am the Lord that sanctify them. (13) But the house of Israel rebelled against me in the wilderness; they walked not in my statutes, and they despised my judgments, which if a man do, he shall even live in them; and my Sabbaths they greatly polluted: then I said, I would pour out my fury upon them in the wilderness, to consume them.... (15) Yet also I lifted up my hand unto them in the

wilderness, that I would not bring them into the land which I had given them, flowing with milk and honey, which is the glory of all lands; (16) because they despised my judgments, and walked not in my statutes, but polluted my Sabbaths: *for their heart went after their idols.* (17) Nevertheless mine eye spared them from destroying them, neither did I make an end of them in the wilderness. (18) But I said unto their children in the wilderness, Walk ye not in the statutes of your fathers, neither observe their judgments, nor defile yourselves with their idols; (19) I am the Lord your God; walk in my statutes, and keep my judgments, and do them; (21) Notwithstanding the children rebelled against me; they walked not in my statutes, neither kept my judgments to do them, which if a man do, he shall even live in them.... (23) I lifted up mine hand unto them also in the wilderness, that I would scatter them among the heathen, and disperse them through the countries; (24) *because they had not executed my judgments, but had despised my statutes,* and had polluted my Sabbaths, and *their eyes were after their fathers' idols.* (25) *Wherefore I gave them also statutes [that were] not good, and judgments whereby they should not live;* (26) and I polluted them in their own gifts, in that they caused to pass through the fire all that openeth the womb, that I might make them desolate, to the end that they might know that I am the Lord. (27) Therefore, son of man, speak unto the house of Israel, and say unto them, Thus saith the Lord God; Yet in this your fathers have blasphemed me, in that they have committed a trespass against me. (28) For when I had brought them into the land, for the which I lifted up mine hand to give it to them, then they saw every high hill, and all the thick trees, and they offered there their sacrifices, and there they presented the provocation of their offering: there also they made their sweet savour, and poured out there their drink offerings." *Ezekiel 20:7-28.SITI December 2, 1886, page 728.5*

No one, after reading the above scripture, can fail to see that the "statutes that were not good," and the "judgments whereby they should not live," were the heathen statutes, and the rites of heathen worship. If any additional evidence is needed, read *verse 31*, which says, "Ye pollute yourselves with all your idols," and *verse 39*, which says: "As for you, O house of Israel, thus saith the Lord God; Go ye, serve ye every one his idols, and hereafter also, if ye will not hearken unto me: but pollute ye my holy name no more with your

gifts, and with your idols.”*SITI December 2, 1886, page 728.6*

In this last verse the whole matter is summed up. God gave them laws of truth, good laws, the doing of which would lead to life. But the people hated these holy commandments, and turned to the worship of dumb idols, which is expressly forbidden by the commandments, and the end of which is death. Therefore God gave them up to their own desires, and allowed them to have their own way.*SITI December 2, 1886, page 728.7*

As still further proof, we have the testimony of Stephen. In his speech before the council, he covered the same ground that is covered by the prophet Ezekiel in the 19th chapter. Said he:-*SITI December 2, 1886, page 728.8*

“And they made a calf in those days, and offered sacrifice unto the idol, and rejoiced in the works of their own hands. Then God turned, and gave them up to worship the host of heaven; as it is written in the book of the prophets, O ye house of Israel, have ye offered to me slain beasts and sacrifices by the space of forty years in the wilderness? Yea, ye took up the tabernacle of Moloch, and the star of your god Remphan, figures which ye made to worship them: and I will carry you away beyond Babylon.” *Acts 7:41-43. SITI December 2, 1886, page 728.9*

Here it is expressly stated that because they refused to worship God, he turned and gave them up to worship the host of heaven, and the figures made to represent the heavenly bodies.*SITI December 2, 1886, page 728.10*

Again, the psalmist covers the same ground, in the following words:-*SITI December 2, 1886, page 728.11*

“Hear, O my people, and I will testify unto thee; O Israel, if thou wilt hearken unto me; there shall no strange god be in thee; neither shalt thou worship any strange god. I am the Lord thy God, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt; open thy mouth wide, and I will fill it. But my people would not hearken to my voice; and Israel would none of me. So I gave them up unto their own hearts; lust; and they walked in their own counsels.” *Psalm 81:8-12. SITI December 2, 1886, page 728.12*

The dealing with Israel is but a repetition of God's dealing with the heathen, who, "when they knew not God, they glorified him not as God," "and changed the glory of the uncorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things. Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness through the lusts of their own hearts;" he also "gave them up unto vile affections;" "and even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind, to do those things which are not convenient." See *Romans 1:21-28*.SITI December 2, 1886, page 728.13

Moreover it is just in this way that God will deal with all who despise him and his truth. Of those who "received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved," the inspired apostle writes:-SITI December 2, 1886, page 728.14

"And with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved. And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie; that they all might be damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness." 2 *Thessalonians 2:10-12*.SITI December 2, 1886, page 728.15

God always gives people just what they want. If they really want righteousness, he fills them with it, as it is written, "Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness; for they shall be filled." *Matthew 5:6*. But if they deliberately choose to do wrong, and hate the good, God gives them up to be "filled with all unrighteousness." *Romans 1:28, 29*.SITI December 2, 1886, page 728.16

Of the twelve spies, ten brought back in evil report, and two good report. *Numbers 13* and *14*. Ten of them said, "We be not able to go up against the people; for they are stronger than we." The other two said, "Let us go up at once, possess it; for we are well able to overcome it." The ten rejected God and his promises; the two trusted him, and relied upon him for aid. The sequel was in harmony with the principle commented on in this article. Those who said they could not go up, never did go up; all those who said they

were able to possess the land, did possess it.*SITI December 2, 1886, page 728.17*

God will not force anybody into the path of righteousness. If men wish to walk therein, he makes the way very plain. But if they refuse and rebel, he gives them ample scope for the exercise of their own will. We conclude, therefore, if that it is best for a man to walk in the way of the Lord, and to keep his commandments. It is a terrible thing for a man to be given up to the pursuit of his own way. "For that they hated knowledge, and did not choose the fear of the Lord; they would none of my counsel; they despised all my reproof. Therefore shall they eat of the fruit of their own way, and be filled with their own devices. For the turning away of the simple shall slay them, and the prosperity of fools shall destroy them. But whoso hearkeneth unto me shall dwell safely, and shall be quiet from fear of evil." *Proverbs 1:29-33. W.SITI December 2, 1886, page 728.18*

December 9, 1886

“Items from the General Conference” The Signs of the Times, 12, 47.

E. J. Waggoner

Since my last report, there have been meetings of the Conference, the International Tract and Missionary Society, Publishing Association, Health Institute, and Sanitarium Improvement Company. The three associations last named have completed their business, of the other associations, much of the work is done in committees, some of which have not yet reported. We shall give only a few items of general interest, that were brought to light during the meetings of the various associations.*SITI December 9, 1886, page 742.1*

Perhaps the committee whose recommendations arouse the most likely interest, is the Committee on Destitute Fields. This committee has not yet completed its work, but has made the following recommendations, which have been approved by the Conference:-*SITI December 9, 1886, page 742.2*

1. That Elder S. N. Haskell go to England*SITI December 9, 1886, page 742.3*

2. That Elder E. W. Whitney, of New York, go to Central Europe.*SITI December 9, 1886, page 742.4*

3. That W. L. H. Baker and why, of Pacific Press, Oakland, go to millboard, Australia, to labor in the office of the *Bible Echo*.*SITI December 9, 1886, page 742.5*

4. That M. G. Huffman, Indiana, labor in Virginia*SITI December 9, 1886, page 742.6*

5. That B. F. Purdham, of Virginia, labor in Indiana.*SITI December 9, 1886, page 742.7*

6. That Elder E. W. Farnsworth go with Elder Haskell to England.*SITI December 9, 1886, page 742.8*

7. That Elder S. Fulton, of Tennessee, labor in Florida.*SITI December 9, 1886, page 742.9*
8. That E. E. Marvin, of Indiana, go to Tennessee to assist Elder Rees.*SITI December 9, 1886, page 742.10*
9. The Elder G. G. Rupert, of Kentucky, go to British Guiana, S. A., visit other parts of the Southern field as he may think best.*SITI December 9, 1886, page 742.11*
10. The Elder W. D. Curtis, of Kansas, go to Australia*SITI December 9, 1886, page 742.12*
11. The Elder H. Shultz, of Nebraska, devote his time to the German work in America, under direction of the General Conference.*SITI December 9, 1886, page 742.13*
12. The Elder J. F. Hanson, of Chicago, labor among the Scandinavians of the New York City and Brooklyn.*SITI December 9, 1886, page 742.14*
13. That Elder Louis Johnson, of Minnesota, devote a portion of this time to the Scandinavian work in Chicago.*SITI December 9, 1886, page 742.15*
14. That Elder J. H. Cook, of Kansas, go to Kentucky at his earliest convenience, to take the place of the Elder G. G. Rupert, who goes to South America.*SITI December 9, 1886, page 742.16*
15. That Elders C. L. Boyd, of Oregon, and D. A. Robinson, of Massachusetts, go to South Africa as soon as they can leave their present fields of labor.*SITI December 9, 1886, page 742.17*
16. That Elder John Fulton, not of California, go to the North Pacific Conference to labor with Elder Boyd, and to take the place of the latter when he shall go to South Africa.*SITI December 9, 1886, page 742.18*

In connection with the meetings of the Conference, and of the International Tract and Missionary Society, the following interesting facts were made known:-*SITI December 9, 1886, page 742.19*

The number of pages of tracts distributed by this society during the year, is 1,250,000. Besides this, the society uses over 600 copies of the SIGNS OF THE TIMES, 350 of *Gospel Sickle*, 250 *Sentinels*, 100 *Good Health*, and over 400 copies of periodicals. This is, of course, entirely outside of what is done by the various State Tract and Missionary Societies. *SITI December 9, 1886, page 742.20*

There are over thirty city missions, employing about one hundred workers. During the year, 19,243 Bible-readings have been held by the city mission workers, with families and individuals. It must be remembered that the city mission work is but little over a year old, and that most of the missions have been established but a few months. These workers have sold reading matter to the amount of \$6,266.90, and had given away a very large amount besides. They have also taken 1,287 yearly subscriptions to various denominational periodicals, besides many for less than a year. *SITI December 9, 1886, page 742.21*

In connection with the city missions in a few of the sea-ports there are ship missionaries. In this work 6,225 ships have been visited, and supplied with 1,100,353 pages of reading material, and 97,411 papers. Two hundred and twenty-nine ships are regularly supplied with the SIGNS OF THE TIMES or some other denominational journal. *SITI December 9, 1886, page 742.22*

To show how God can make even the wrath of men to praise him, we give an incident related by Bro. A. T. Robinson, of the Brooklyn (N. Y.) Mission. A clergyman who sought the interest that was being awakened for the truth, as a result of the faithful labors of the city missionaries, made an appointment to preach against the Sabbath, announcing as his subject, "Who Changed the Sabbath?" A young man, a printer, saw the announcement, and as he had had some curiosity on that subject, he and his wife went. Instead of gaining intimation upon the Sabbath question, he heard a tirade against Seventh-day Adventists. This did not satisfy the young man, but it served as an advertisement of the mission, where he went and heard the truth. As the result of this one sermon against the Sabbath, six persons have begun to keep it "according to the commandment." Since the mission started in Brooklyn, only a short time ago, seventeen have begun to keep the Sabbath. *SITI*

December 9, 1886, page 742.23

Bro. W. H. Saxby, of the Washington (D. C.) Mission, gave an interesting account of his work. He found great difficulty in starting the work, but has sold in that city over \$700 worth of books, and has held nearly 1,000 Bible-readings. Thus the truth is spreading.*SITI December 9, 1886, page 742.24*

The meetings of the Health Institute Association brought out many interesting facts, of which we can give only a few. This work was established in 1867 under the name of Health Institute, but it was reorganized in 1876 under the name of Medical and Surgical Sanitarium. The Sanitarium is located at Battle Creek, having a large core of competent physicians, with J. H. Kellogg, M.D., as superintendent. The business has outgrown the frame building that was first occupied, and now occupies a building with the following dimensions:-*SITI December 9, 1886, page 742.25*

Entire length, 475 feet; height, 84 feet; width of main part, 40, 46, and 54 feet; length of promenade in verandas and halls, more than half a mile; floor space, more than two acres. This building is probably the most perfectly ventilated structure in the United States, is heated by steam, and lighted by the Edison incandescent electric light. Each room has an independent supply of fresh, pure air at all times, without the necessity of opening windows, and the ventilation and heating are so arranged that one room may have a warm, moist atmosphere, while that of the adjoining one may be cool and dry, if so desired. The sewerage is perfect, and such is the care taken that nowhere about the building, from basement to attic, is there the slightest unpleasant odor.*SITI December 9, 1886, page 742.26*

The main building will accommodate nearly 250 patients, and about 150 more can be accommodated in the cottages near by, and belonging to the institution. During the past year the patronage has been larger than ever before. The average number of patients has been about 225, and the entire number treated within the year is not less than 1,200. Of course a small army of helpers is needed to properly care for so many, and of these there are about 150. The receipts from patients for the year have been over \$122,000,

against \$86,000 last year.*SITI December 9, 1886, page 742.27*

To feed a large family requires over 1,200 barrels of flour a year; 1,000 bushels of potatoes, and 700 barrels of apples. Four barrels of milk per day is consumed. The table is bountifully supplied with healthful food tastefully serve. One rarely sees so large an institution as this carried on with so little apparent friction.*SITI December 9, 1886, page 742.28*

While this institution is not sectarian, and patients of all classes are received, all having perfect freedom in matters pertaining to the conscience, it is the aim of the managers to have a religious influence pervading the house. Family worship is regularly sustained morning and evening, and on Sunday evenings there is usually a sermon in the parlor. Religious services for the helpers are also frequently held. There is a Sabbath-school of 160 members in connection with the institution, and also a missionary society conducted by the workers, which uses 300 copies of Good Health, 200 copies of the SIGNS OF THE TIMES, and 50 of the *American Sentinel*.*SITI December 9, 1886, page 742.29*

During this session of the Conference, the early-morning is devoted to religious services, a social meeting being used to help, the days are devoted to business, and the evening to preaching or some other interesting exercise. Monday evening was left for the teachers' meeting of the Battle Creek Sabbath-school, which those from abroad were invited to attend. On Tuesday evening (Nov. 23) there was a Bible-reading by Elder A. T. Robinson; on Wednesday evening a sermon by Elder I. D. Van Horn, and on Thursday evening one by Elder M. C. Wilcox, of England. Friday evening was devoted to a consideration of some teachers of the city missions, the time being occupied by Elder N. C. McClure, of San Francisco, Elder A. T. Robinson, of Brooklyn, Elder H. W. Miller, of Grand Rapids, Mich., and Elder George Starr, of Chicago. On Sabbath there was a sermon by the Elder S. N. Haskell, on the subject of education.*SITI December 9, 1886, page 742.30*

Every day at eight o'clock A.M. a large class of ministers and other laborers has met in the tabernacle to receive instructions from Dr. Kellogg on the subject of health and temperance. These meetings

are very interesting and profitable, and those who have attended are becoming fitted to preach the gospel of health, while they are teaching people the way of life eternal. W. *Battle Creek*, Nov. 28. *SITI December 9, 1886, page 742.31*

December 16, 1886

“Items from the General Conference” *The Signs of the Times*, 12, 48.

E. J. Waggoner

The past week has been a busy one for those attending the Conference, yet we have but few items of interest to the General reader. The election of officers of the General Conference has taken place, resulting as follows: President, Elder Geo. I. Butler; Secretary, Elder U. Smith; Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. M. J. Chapman; Treasurer, A. R. Henry; Executive Committee, Elders G. I. Butler, S. N. Haskell, W. C. White, O. A. Olsen, R. A. Underwood. Following this election, the Constitution was so amended as to call for seven members of the executive board, instead of five, and the Nominating Committee were instructed to recommend two persons to complete the required number. *SITI December 16, 1886, page 758.1*

There was probably never before a session of the General Conference in which so much attention was given to the work in foreign countries as has been in this one. This is what we should naturally expect; for since the Third Angel's Message is to be preached “in all the world, for a witness unto all nations,” it would be natural that the nearer we come to the end, the more extensively will the message be preached. Provision has been made in this Conference for England, Scandinavia, Central Europe, South America, South Africa, British Honduras, and Australia. The additional items voted by the Conference, according to the recommendation of the Committee on Distribution of Labor, are as follows:—*SITI December 16, 1886, page 758.2*

1. That ...bles and wife, of Vermont, go to Indianapolis, to take charge of the mission in that city. *SITI December 16, 1886, page 758.3*

2. That R. M. Rees, Tennessee, spend what time he can in looking after the work in North Carolina. *SITI December 16, 1886, page 758.4*

3. That W. C. Sisley and wife, of Michigan, go to California. Sister Sisley to conduct the missionary class in Healdsburg College.*SITI December 16, 1886, page 758.5*

4. That E. W. Farnsworth remain in Battle Creek until he goes to England with Elder Haskell, and that Sister Farnsworth take charge of the missionary work in the College filling the place hitherto filled by Sister Sisley.*SITI December 16, 1886, page 758.6*

5. G. W. Anglebarger and wife, of Ohio, go to Atlanta, Georgia, to superintend the mission to be established in that city.*SITI December 16, 1886, page 758.7*

6. Richard Coggeshall, now at Basel, Switzerland, is to go to the publishing house in Christiania, Norway, as soon as consistent, to spend several months giving instruction in printing and press work.*SITI December 16, 1886, page 758.8*

7. Ludwig Henricksen, of Iowa, goes to Norway to instruct and assist in the Bible-reading work.*SITI December 16, 1886, page 758.9*

8. Sisters Fannie Bolton and Hattie Annes are to go to Washington, D. C., to work in the mission there.*SITI December 16, 1886, page 758.10*

9. Elder F. D. Starr, of Illinois, after spending a few months in obtaining all information possible about city mission work, colporteur work, etc., is to go to Basel, Switzerland, to devote himself especially to the German work.*SITI December 16, 1886, page 758.11*

10. Elders S. S. Smith and C. W. Olds, of Wisconsin, are to labor in Alabama and Mississippi.*SITI December 16, 1886, page 758.12*

11. Elder T. H. Gibbs, of the New Orleans Mission, is to spend some time in British Honduras, looking after the cause there, and baptizing those who are ready for that ordinance.*SITI December 16, 1886, page 758.13*

12. Geo. A. King, of Michigan, accompany Elder Rupert on his trip

to British Guiana to assist him by selling publications.*SITI December 16, 1886, page 758.14*

13. Chas. F. Curtis is to go to Atlanta, Georgia, to work in connection with the mission to be established there.*SITI December 16, 1886, page 758.15*

14. Elder M. C. Wilcox is to return to England, to edit the British paper.*SITI December 16, 1886, page 758.16*

15. Sister Mary Heilsen, of Battle Creek, will go to Christiania, Norway, to labor in connection with the publishing work.*SITI December 16, 1886, page 758.17*

The Sabbath-school Association, after adopting a revised constitution, elected the following officers:-*SITI December 16, 1886, page 758.18*

President, C. H. Jones; Vice-President, A. R. Oyen; Secretary, Winnie Loughborough; Executive Committee, C. H. Jones, A. B. Oyen, W. C. White, J. E. White, G. H. Bell, D. M. Canright, Winnie Loughborough.*SITI December 16, 1886, page 758.19*

The Committee on Contributions brought in a recommendation that the contributions for the coming year be given to the following missions: first quarter, South Africa; second, Norwegian; third, Central European; fourth, British. This report was, after some remarks, amended so as to recommend that during the coming year the Sabbath-school of the United States support the South African Mission. This proposal was heartily supported, and was adopted with enthusiasm. We believe that in carrying out this recommendation our Sabbath-school will experience more of the blessing of God than ever before. W.*SITI December 16, 1886, page 758.20*

December 23, 1886

“The End Approaching” The Signs of the Times, 12, 49.

E. J. Waggoner

“And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come.” *Matthew 24:14*. This language occurs in the discourse which the Saviour delivered in answer to the question: “What shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?” The entire chapter in which these words occur is an answer to this question. The question as to whether or not the Lord will come again is not mooted. There was no uncertainty in the minds of the disciples on this point. They very well knew that the Lord would come to reign over his people; all that troubled them was to know the signs which should precede his coming. These the Saviour proceeded to give. Besides the physical signs in the sun, moon, and stars, which have all been fulfilled, he gave the one which heads this paragraph, and which is now in process of fulfillment. *SITI December 23, 1886, page 774.1*

What is “this gospel of the kingdom”? It is that which our Saviour preached in all his earthly ministry. *Matthew 4:23; Mark 1:14*. “Gospel” means “good news.” The gospel which is to be preached “in all the world,” “to all people,” is the good news of a Saviour, “which is Christ the Lord.” *Luke 2:10, 11*. A Saviour must save people from something, and so we find that Jesus saves his people from their sins. *Matthew 1:21*. But the wrath of God (*Romans 1:18; Ephesians 5:5, 6*), resulting in death (*Romans 6:23*), is visited upon all sin; so that the salvation of people from sin must also be salvation from the wrath of God, and so it is. *Romans 5:9*. Being saved from sin may be equivalent to being justified by faith, but being saved from wrath is the final and complete salvation from sin and all its consequences. And this is the salvation of which Isaiah speaks when he says that “Israel shall be saved in the Lord with an everlasting salvation.” *Isaiah 45:17*. It is that salvation which the apostle Peter says shall be brought unto us “at the revelation of Jesus Christ.” *1 Peter 1:9-13*. *SITI December 23, 1886, page 774.2*

This final salvation is the end or object of our faith. *1 Peter 1:9*. People may talk as much as they please about doing right for its own sake, but the fact remains that if there were to be no future life there would be no incentive to right living. Paul says that "if in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable" (*1 Corinthians 15:19*), and in harmony with this he continues that if there is no resurrection we would do well to eat and drink, and get all the enjoyment we can from this life while it is passing. *1 Corinthians 15:32*. What comfort would it be to a sinner to assure him that his sins are all forgiven, but that there is nothing for him beyond this present life? None at all. In such a case forgiveness of sins would profit him nothing. So then the preaching of the gospel comprehends not alone the announcement that Christ died for sinners, but that through his death he has brought immortality to light. We believe that no one who has ever professed to preached the gospel has omitted the fact that an eternal inheritance awaits the overcomers. *SITI December 23, 1886, page 774.3*

But this eternal inheritance is "reserved in Heaven," and is to be revealed only "in the last time." *1 Peter 1:4, 5*. It is only when Christ comes "the second time" that salvation is brought to them that look for him. Christ himself told his disciples (*John 14:1-3*) that he would come again to receive them unto himself so that they might be with him, plainly indicating that they could be with him in no other way except by his second coming. Even though they should die they could that be with him unless he should return. Compare *John 8:21* and *13:33*. And in harmony with this Paul says, "by the word of the Lord," that "the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the Archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first; then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord." *1 Thessalonians 4:16, 17*. *SITI December 23, 1886, page 774.4*

Now what have we found? Just this: that the gospel brings to view the eternal redemption, and that any preaching of the gospel which should omit the future inheritance of the saints would be very incomplete; and that there is no future inheritance for the saints unless the Lord comes again. Therefore we are justified in saying that the preaching of the gospel necessarily includes the preaching

of the second coming of Christ, and that those who ignore or deny the second coming of Christ, do not preach the whole gospel. Still further: in the fourteenth of Revelation we read of three messages that immediately precede the second coming of Christ. *Verses 6-14*. The first of these passages announces they are of God's Judgment come, and it and the two which follow given instruction how to prepare for that event. The Third Angel's Message includes both the others, and contains the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus,-the sum of all the instruction necessary to make "the remnant of Israel" a pure people, prepared for the coming of the Lord. It is the gospel in its simplicity and purity, and is therefore the gospel just as it was preached by Christ and his apostles. It announces the second coming of Christ, and tells how to be ready for that event. Therefore we confidently affirm that our Saviour's words in *Matthew, 24:14* may justly be paraphrased thus: "And the Third Angel's Message shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come." We think that no one who has carefully followed this brief exposition can dissent from this conclusion. *SITI December 23, 1886, page 774.5*

This thing,-the preaching of the Third Angel's Message in all the world, to all nations,-is all that remains to be done before the coming of the Lord; and this work will be cut short in righteousness; "because a short work will the Lord make upon the earth." *Romans 9:28*. And short indeed it must be, for we *know* from our Saviour's own words, that his coming is so near that he is "even at the doors." *Matthew 24:33*. The generation now living upon the earth will witness the coming of the Lord with all his holy angels. There is no conjecture about this, no assumption. It is just as true as that Christ is the Son of God. *SITI December 23, 1886, page 774.6*

"But," some one will say, "it is impossible that Christ should come for many years if every nation must first hear of the Third Angel's Message; because there are vast multitudes who have not even heard that there is such a thing." We have known many who stumble over this, even of those who believe in the soon coming of our Lord. Let us see what force there is in this objection. *SITI December 23, 1886, page 774.7*

1. It is not necessary to the fulfillment of our Saviour's words, that

the Third Angel's Message should be preached to every individual in the world. Then will there not be partiality shown? No; and for this reason: There are thousands who have had, besides the light which comes from nature, a partial knowledge of the gospel, and have rejected it. They have deliberately rejected the light which they had, and have steeled their hearts to the influences of God's Spirit. Now of what use would it be to carry the Third Angel's Message to such? None at all. It would be casting pearls before swine. If they have refused a little light because it condemned their evil deeds, they would certainly reject greater light for the same reason. We may not know who are and who are not worthy to receive the full light of the gospel, but God knows, and will direct the truth to all who are not already reprobate.*SITI December 23, 1886, page 774.8*

2. There are, no doubt, thousands of whom we have no knowledge, who are living out the truth of the Third Angel's Message. When Elijah thought that he alone of all the inhabitants of Israel worshiped the true God, the Lord said to him, "Yet I have left me seven thousand in Israel, all the knees which have not bowed unto Baal, and every mouth which hath not kissed him." *1 Kings 19:18*. We are apt to think that nothing is being done except what we do, forgetting that God has infinite resources at his command.*SITI December 23, 1886, page 774.9*

3. It is not necessary that all who believe shall have heard the voice of the living creature. The Bible contains everything necessary to making a man "perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works," and for years Bible societies have been scattering Bibles broadcast over the world. The Spirit of God can guide the reader of the Bible into all truth, even though he have no human preceptor. Add to this the reception of the tract or a paper which may start a new train of thought, and the reader can readily see how there may be thousands living out the Third Angel's Message, who are entirely unknown to the great body of believers.*SITI December 23, 1886, page 774.10*

4. Lastly we want to consider what progress is being made in the preaching of "the gospel of the kingdom,"-the Third Angel's Message,-in all the world. Here we must caution the reader against jumping at conclusions. He must not base his calculations simply on

the comparative few who are now known to be professing the truth. Some will reason thus: "This message has been preached for forty years, and there are only about thirty thousand who are known to be Seventh-day Adventists; therefore it will take perhaps as many years more to warn the whole world." This is very defective reasoning. We should consider, not simply the number who have been warned, but the improved facilities for warning the world. *SITI December 23, 1886, page 774.11*

(1) As a matter of fact every civilized nation has already received to a greater or lesser extent the knowledge of the Third Angel's Message. There is not a nation under heaven that is not known to contain Sabbath-keepers; and by the thoroughly-organized system of missionary work which has been adopted, every one of these Seventh-day Adventists is a center from which the truth may radiate. True, there are few of these as compared to the great mass of professed Christian; but the Bible does not say that the gospel shall be preached as a converter of all nations, but only as a *witness* either for or against them. *SITI December 23, 1886, page 774.12*

(2) Through the agency of the press it is easier to reach a million people now than it was to reach a hundred in the days of Paul. Let us note the progress that has been made in this branch of the message. About thirty-five years ago Elder James White published the first paper devoted to the dissemination of the last gospel message. It was a very small sheet, containing about one-eighth as much a matter as the SIGNS OF THE TIMES, having no subscription list, and no prospect of support or of regular publication. The whole of the first issue was carried to the post-office in a small carpet sack. From that date the work has not taken a retrograde step. Now the Seventh-day Adventists have fully equipped houses of publication in Battle Creek, Mich.; Oakland, Cal.; Basel, Switzerland, Christiania, Norway; Great Grimsby, England, and Melbourne, Australia. These are all devoted to the spread of the Third Angel's Message. In these offices the truth is published in the following languages: English, German, French, Italian, Spanish, Danish, Norwegian, Holland, and Romanian. We have not the facts at hand concerning all these offices of publication, and will therefore take as a specimen the central

publishing house at Battle Creek, Mich., which we have just visited, the items which we have gathered are as follows:-*SITI December 23, 1886, page 774.13*

The amount of floor space occupied in the buildings is about 40,000 square feet. The number of hands employed is about 130. The institution issues the following periodicals: *Review and Herald*, an 8-page semi-monthly; *Youth's Instructor*, a 4-page weekly; *Simme der Warheit* (German), an 8-page semi-monthly; *Advent Tidende* (Danish), a 16-page semi-monthly magazine; the *Harold* (Swedish), a 16-page semi-monthly. The circulation of these periodicals aggregates about one hundred and forty thousand copies a month. Besides this, there are sent out from this office books, pamphlets, and tracts to the amount of a ton for each day in the year.*SITI December 23, 1886, page 775.1*

These are simple, unvarnished facts concerning the central office of publication. Let the reader weigh them well, considering that other offices are putting out a proportionate amount, and that in every part of the world men and women are industriously circulating this reading matter, and then let him ask how long it will be before all people will have been warned of the speedy coming of Christ. Truly this thing is not being done in a corner. In a future article we shall show that within a space of time that may be reckoned by months, "this gospel of the kingdom," despised and hated though it may be, will be the all-absorbing topic of the day. The great newspapers of the land will herald it, and its bitterest enemies will assist in lifting it up as a witness to the people.*SITI December 23, 1886, page 775.2*

May the Lord help all to awaken to the importance of the present time; may we not delay action until the prophecy is fulfilled, when it will be too late for action; but may we do our part in fulfilling the prophecy, thus saying by our actions as well as by our words, "Even so, come, Lord Jesus." W.*SITI December 23, 1886, page 775.3*

"Educated Brutality" The Signs of the Times, 12, 49.

E. J. Waggoner

It is becoming more and more apparent that the principal aim of the

university athletic clubs is by organization to promote brutality. In some recent note from a certain university we read of the reorganization of the foot-ball club, and it was said that new men will take the places of those who have "preferred to retire on account of disabilities resulting from the double series of last year's games." Not long since while on a railroad train we heard some college students talking of their contests, and one of them told how he went on a certain occasion with a loaded cane, expecting to have a part in a college "rush," but for some reason he did not have an opportunity to use his murderous weapon.*SITI December 23, 1886, page 775.4*

The following from the *Independent* will give some idea of the point to which college athletics have now come. Its outspoken condemnation is just, and is richly deserved.*SITI December 23, 1886, page 775.5*

"Eleven big animals from Yale University and eleven big animals from Princeton College expressed our gratitude to God on Thanksgiving day for his mercies during the year, by such a beastly fight as ought to be prohibited by law and punished as the fights of the prize ring are punished. This is plain language, but it is none too strong. Let it be understood that we do not have the least objection to manly sport. We believe and would encourage it. But this is nothing of that sort. There is a game of foot-ball, or was, which was manly and healthful. It was a game of pluck and skill. The game as now conducted is only organized brutality. First there was a quarrel as to where the game should be played. This preliminary quarrel was so prolonged and bitter that prepared the way for a contest which should not be a game, but a fight full of animosity.*SITI December 23, 1886, page 775.6*

"Under the Rugby rules the ball as partly kicked from the beginning to the end of the game, but is seized and carried, and the effort of the players is by all possible violence to take the ball from a player who holds it. He can be caught and pounded with the fist, thrown on the ground and stamped on with all one's fury. At Princeton on last Thanksgiving day it was well understood that there would be no mercy shown. The game, so called, was a slugging match. The brutes pounded and kicked each other, and that they did not kill

each other was through no restraint, but by the mercy of God. One of the players was severely injured and had to be carried off the field. It was an unmanly, degrading, beastly exhibition of malice and cruelty.*SITI December 23, 1886, page 775.7*

“Then after the contest the fights were continued whenever Yale and Princeton men came together in a drinking saloon or at a hotel bar. At one public the proprietor had to turn off the gas to stop a fight. Of course there was gambling over the result. It is not foot-ball we object to, but such foot-ball; not games, but gambling; not contests, but drunkenness. Such games as this of last Thanksgiving day should be strictly forbidden by our colleges. They are a disgrace to a Christian university, not to say a Christian age, and they would not be permitted to disgrace even the dirty streets and dens of Five Points. Shame on all those who participate in such at Princeton.”*SITI December 23, 1886, page 775.8*

December 30, 1886

“Did the Patriarchs Know Christ?” The Signs of the Times, 12, 50.

E. J. Waggoner

A very common answer to the above question is that they did not, or that they had at the most a very limited knowledge of Christ in his work, and had no just conception of the plan of salvation. Such a position we believe to be wholly erroneous, and subversive of Bible truth. If it were so, it would show that God's ways are not equal, and that in different ages of the world he has different ways of saving men; and still worse, the holding of such a view dishonors Christ, by virtually denying that in all things he has the pre-eminence. We therefore wish briefly to give a scriptural answer to the question. *SITI December 30, 1886, page 790.1*

Going back to the time of a fall we find Christ promised to Adam and Eve, as the one who should conquer sin and Satan. Said the Lord to the serpent: “And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.” *Genesis 3:15. SITI December 30, 1886, page 790.2*

Some may say that this is so slight a reference to the Messiah, that the fallen pair could not possibly have derived much, if any, hope from it. We are not to suppose that the very brief record in the first three chapters of Genesis contains more than a bare outline of what the Lord spoke to our first parents. But whether this was all the information that was given them or not, it is certain that they fully understood the consequences of their sin, and knew just how they might find pardon. This we know from the fact that in process of time both Cain and Abel brought offerings to the Lord, to the latter of which the Lord had respect, while he rejected the former. Why was this difference shown? Because Cain's offering, being only the fruit of the ground, indicated no faith in the promised Redeemer, while Abel's offering, being of the firstling of his flock, showed faith in the Lamb of God, which alone could take away the sin of the world. *SITI December 30, 1886, page 790.3*

This is what the apostle Paul says in *Hebrews 11:4*: “By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witness that he was righteous, God testifying of his gifts; and by it he being dead yet speaketh.” That is to say that Abel’s sacrifice was the sacrifice of faith, and by it he obtained that righteousness “which is through the faith of Jesus Christ, the righteousness of God by faith.” *SITI December 30, 1886, page 790.4*

Coming down to the time of Abraham we find the clearest evidence of a full knowledge of Christ. The covenant that God made with him was confirmed “in Christ.” *Galatians 3:17*. It was therefore Abraham’s faith in Christ that was “counted unto him for righteousness.” Moreover, Abraham’s faith was so great that he was called the father of the faithful; and the highest position to which a person can attain is to be a child of Abraham. The most perfect Christians on earth only “walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham, which he had being yet uncircumcised.” *Romans 4:12*. This is because Abraham sought Christ’s day and was glad. *John 8:56*. He saw and understood the complete work of Christ, and being justified by faith he rejoiced in hope of the glory of God. See *Romans 5:1, 2*. *SITI December 30, 1886, page 790.5*

Still later we have the record of Moses. Paul tells us that it was his faith in Christ that led him to leave the court of Egypt. “By faith Moses, when he was come to years, refused to be called the son of Pharaoh’s daughter; choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God, than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season; esteeming the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures in Egypt; for he had respect unto the recompense of the reward.” *Hebrews 11:24-26*. This shows only that Moses had full faith in Christ, but also that unbelievers have a knowledge of him, for if it were not so Moses could not have suffered the “reproach of Christ.” *SITI December 30, 1886, page 790.6*

Those Israelites who are willing also to suffer the reproach of Christ were sustained by him, for Paul says that “they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them; and that Rock was Christ.” *1 Corinthians 10:4*. And this shows that the pious Jews were as truly Christians as are any people who may believe in Christ of the present time. By the sacrifices which they offered they indicated

their faith in the Redeemer who was to die on Calvary, just the same as we do in the Lord's Supper eat the bread and drink of the cup "to show the Lord's death till he come." To say that they did not understand Christ's mediatorial work is to deny the Scriptures of truth.*SITI December 30, 1886, page 790.7*

But there were many Jews who did not believe in Christ. So there are now in the church many professed Christians who know nothing of Christ. The preaching of the cross is really foolishness to them as much as it ever was to the Greeks, although they may not scoff at it. When Christ appeared in the flesh the great body of the Jewish nation rejected him. Even so he has told us that when he comes the second time faith will be a rare thing on the earth. But we must remember that the reason why the Jews rejected Christ was because they did not believe the sacred Scriptures, just as the reason why the Son of man when he comes will scarcely find faith on the earth, will be because of the growing skepticism in regard to the Bible. Already professors of religion openly say, "Where is the promise of his coming?" To those unbelieving Jews Christ said: "Do not think that I will accuse you to the Father; there is one that accuseth you, even Moses, in whom ye trust. For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed me: for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?" *John 5:45-47. SITI December 30, 1886, page 790.8*

Taking a more general view, we learn that not only Moses but all the prophets taught the facts concerning Christ and his work. Peter says that the prophets "prophesied of the grace that should come onto you; searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow." *1 Peter 1:10, 11*. And even a slight acquaintance with the prophets will serve to show that every feature in Christ's ministry, both on earth and in Heaven, was foretold by them.*SITI December 30, 1886, page 790.9*

In *Daniel 9:25-27* we find the time when the Messiah should appear given with the utmost exactness. Micah (*chap. 5:2*) told that he should be born in Bethlehem of Judea. Isaiah foretold the fact that he should be born of a virgin. Compare *Isaiah 7:14* and *Matthew*

1:23. Zechariah foretold Christ's triumphal entry into Jerusalem. *Zechariah 9:9*. Daniel's vision revealed the exact time when Christ should be crucified. *Daniel 9:27*. In that wonderful chapter, the fifty-third of Isaiah, the people were told of his life of humility and death of his final ignominious death; that "the Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all;" that his soul was to be poured out unto death as an offering for sin, and that "with his stripes we are healed." Moreover the fact that he should be buried with the rich, is plainly stated. David foretold the well-known incident of the crucifixion when he said by the Spirit: "They gave me also gall for my meat; and in my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink." *Psalms 69:21*. He also speaks of the piercing of Christ's hands and feet (*Psalms 22:16*) and prophecies of the action of the Roman soldiers in these words: "They parted my garments among them, and cast lots upon my vesture." *Verse 18*. He also understood that Christ should be born of his line, and knowing that his throne is to endure "as days of heaven" (*Psalms 89:29*) he prophesied of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul should not be left in the grave, and that his flesh should not see corruption. Compare *Psalms 16:8-10* and *Acts 2:25-31*. *SITI December 30, 1886, page 790.10*

David also describes Christ's ascension to Heaven after his victory over death (*Psalms 24:7-10*) and also declares that Christ is to sit at the right hand of God until his foes are made his footstool. *Psalms 110:1*. The prophet Zechariah declared that Christ was to sit as a priest upon his Father's throne, securing, in conjunction with the Father, peace for troubled humanity. *Zechariah 6:12, 13*. And Enoch, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of the glorious second coming of Christ to execute judgment on the ungodly. *Jude 14*. *SITI December 30, 1886, page 790.11*

But time and space would fail to speak of all that the prophets have said concerning Christ. Let one more text suffice to cover the whole ground. The apostle Paul declared himself to be a "servant of the Lord Jesus Christ;" he gloried in the cross of Christ, and preached nothing but Jesus Christ and him crucified. Christ was his constant theme, yet when he stood before Agrippa he said: "Having therefore obtained help of God, I continue unto this day, witnessing both to small and great, saying none other things than those which Moses and the prophets did say should come; that Christ should suffer,

and that he should be the first that should rise from the dead, and should show a light unto the people, and to the Gentiles.” *Acts 20:22, 23*. If the apostle Paul in all his preaching did not go outside of what Moses and the prophets had said, they certainly must have given very accurate information concerning Christ. *SITI December 30, 1886, page 790.12*

Who can read how Isaiah saw Christ “sitting on a throne high and lifted up,” or and how Ezekiel saw “visions of God,” or how Enoch “walked with God,” and doubt but that these men had a most intimate knowledge of Christ and his work for fallen man? And that not only they, but multitudes of others, had a knowledge of Christ, is proved by the fact that they “through faith subdued kingdoms, brought righteousness, obtained promises,” and that besides Christ there is no salvation in any other, “for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved.” *Acts 4:12*. W. *SITI December 30, 1886, page 790.13*

